



Card. Tommaso de Vio, O.P.

Commentary on Romans

From the Greek Text

Sonnet 4.5 / Gpt 5.2 Translation

COMMENTARY ON ROMANS

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

FROM THE GREEK TEXT

AUTHORED BY
CARDINAL TOMMASO DE VIO, O.P.

TRANSLATED WITH SONNET 4.5 / GPT 5.1

IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD MM.XX.V.

ORIGINAL LATIN SOLD IN PARIS BY GUILLAUME DE
BOSSOZEL, RUE SAINT-JACQUES, AT THE
SIGN OF THE RED CASTLE

YEAR OF OUR LORD M.D.XXX.VI.

TO THE MEMORY OF CARDINAL CAJETAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMMENTARY ON ROMANS

CHAPTER 1	1
CHAPTER 2	26
CHAPTER 3	43
CHAPTER 4	61
CHAPTER 5	73
CHAPTER 6	90
CHAPTER 7	106
CHAPTER 8	125
CHAPTER 9	170
CHAPTER 10	190
CHAPTER 11	202
CHAPTER 12	217
CHAPTER 13	228
CHAPTER 14	236
CHAPTER 15	248
CHAPTER 16	259

TO THE READER

This English translation of Cardinal Cajetan's commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, drawn from his *Commentarii in Omnes Divi Pauli et Aliorum Apostolorum Epistolas*, has been produced using Claude Sonnet 4.5 for initial translation, corrected with Open AI's GPT-5.2, and subsequently reviewed under human oversight for accuracy and fidelity to the original Latin text. While effort has been made to provide a reliable and scholarly rendering of Cardinal Cajetan's commentary on Romans, readers are cautioned that no translation can fully replace consultation of the original Latin source, which remains the sole authoritative text for academic citation and theological reference.

Should any errors be discovered in this translation they must never be imputed to the venerable author, Cardinal Cajetan, but always to the translator and editorial team responsible for this English edition. The integrity and precision of Cardinal Cajetan's original commentary remain unimpeachable; any deficiencies in the present work reflect solely the limitations of the translation process.

Particular caution should be exercised regarding citations of Sacred Scripture, the Church Fathers, and scholastic authorities throughout this work. The scans of sixteenth-century printed editions from which this translation was prepared often present significant challenges in distinguishing Roman numerals from Arabic numerals, capital "I" from the numeral "1," and other orthographic ambiguities in bibliographic

TO THE READER

references. While the editorial team has endeavored to verify and correct such citations wherever possible, readers engaged in serious scholarly research are strongly advised to confirm all references against the original Latin text or other reliable critical editions. Errors in numerical references to books, chapters, questions, articles, or distinctions—however inadvertent—may appear in this translation and should not be attributed to Cardinal Cajetan's meticulous scholarship.

A further caution concerns the theological weight and ecclesiastical reception of Cardinal Cajetan's biblical commentaries. While Cardinal Cajetan stands as one of the chief representatives of early modern scholasticism and the author of an authoritative and extensive commentary on St. Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae*, his final-decade exegetical project—of which the present commentary on Romans forms a part—often proceeds with notably greater interpretive freedom.

As Michael O'Connor observes, Cajetan in these biblical works proved "prepared to venture his own views—even when they take a different tack entirely from the whole tradition" (*Cajetan's Biblical Commentaries: Motive and Method* [Leiden: Brill, 2017], Introduction, pp. 1–2). Though this exegetical liberty remained fundamentally ecclesial in intention—Cajetan "submitted all of his exegetical works to the judgment of the pope" (O'Connor, Introduction, p. 6)—the historical reception of these commentaries was nonetheless contested. As O'Connor notes, "as soon as Cajetan's biblical commentaries appeared in print ... the torrent of reviewers was against him" (ch. 7, p. 237), and "Cajetan's views on canonicity were discussed, and rejected, at the Council of Trent, and his works subject to careful scrutiny and official censorship thereafter" (Introduction, p. 7). The Council of Trent's determinations "ensured that Cajetan's more supple biblical work remained outside the Catholic mainstream" (Conclusion, p. 254).

Readers are therefore advised that the exegetical positions advanced in the present commentary should be understood as historically situated interpretive proposals, to be weighed carefully against the Church's definitive teaching and the broader consensus of the

TO THE READER

patristic and scholastic tradition, rather than assumed to carry the same settled doctrinal authority commonly and rightly attributed to Cardinal Cajetan's magisterial Thomistic exposition of the *Summa Theologiae*.

This translation is offered as a study aid and gateway text for English-speaking scholars, students, and theologians who seek access to Cardinal Cajetan's profound commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. It is not intended to supplant the Latin original in academic discourse or reference.

CARDINAL CAJETAN OF ST. SIXTUS
COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL
TO THE ROMANS

¶ Having set forth the text of the four Evangelists, the Epistles of St. Paul come next, and first the Epistle to the Romans. This Epistle, in its first division, is divided into a salutation and a narration, at “First indeed.” It is uncertain whether Paul was from the beginning a man of two names, or whether from the beginning he was named Saul and in the course of time was named Paul. For from the fact that he always names himself Paul in all his Epistles, it appears that he was named Paul from the beginning; otherwise, naming himself by a new name, he would have made himself ambiguous. Hence also St. Peter, newly named, names himself “Simon Peter.” And consequently Paul ought to have named himself “Saul Paul.” But from the fact that in the Acts of the Apostles up to the thirteenth chapter—indeed up to the conversion of Sergius Paulus the proconsul—he is always named Saul, and from that point Luke begins to name him Paul, it appears that he received the name Paul from the proconsul. But whenever he was named Paul, it is established that he was unwilling to use the regal name (namely Saul or Saulus), but a humble name. For “Paul” is a diminutive from “little,” according to grammar: hence “a little,” “a very little,” “a tiny little,” and so forth.

¶ “Servant of Jesus Christ.” A servant, whatever he is, belongs to his lord; and he signifies that he is wholly Jesus Christ’s.

CHAPTER ONE

¶ “Called apostle.” The sense is not “named apostle,” but “summoned apostle”; that is, called to the apostolate. I did not make myself an apostle, but I was called to the apostolate. “This man is a chosen vessel for me, to bear my name,” and so forth.

¶ “Set apart for the Gospel of God.” In the Acts of the Apostles, chapter thirteen: “The Holy Spirit said: Set apart for me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have taken them.” Thus he makes mention of both deeds: both of the first election, by saying “called apostle,” and of the subsequent setting apart for preaching the Gospel, by saying “set apart for the Gospel of God.”

¶ “Which he promised beforehand.” Anyone can feign that the Gospel of God is whatever he himself proclaims. And therefore, to exclude such fictions and inventions, he declares the conditions of the Gospel to the preaching of which he has been sent. He declares that it is not a human contrivance, not newly invented or arising unexpectedly, but long ago promised by God.

¶ “Through his prophets.” He cites as witnesses of the divine promise the prophets—not of idols, but his own; that is, those who were undoubtedly his prophets.

¶ “In the holy Scriptures.” This divine promise, through the prophets, was committed to writing, so that every suspicion of fiction may be excluded. And not in just any writings, but in holy Scriptures, pure from every error, from every admixture. And he intends, in the literal sense, the Scriptures which among the Hebrews are called the holy Scriptures, namely, pure from every mixture of human opinion. And these are the books of the Old Testament which we call canonical. Great is the commendation of the Gospel from this, that it was promised by God through his prophets in holy Scriptures. For no sect—indeed not even the true faith of the Fathers under the Mosaic Law—has been endowed with a similar prerogative.

¶ “Concerning his Son.” The matter of the Gospel is explained. For what is said “concerning his Son” is referred to what he had said, “the Gospel of God.” He declares what he announces as the Gospel of God.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “Who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh.” The pronoun “to him” is superfluous. And if one were to render word for word, it should not be read “who was made,” but “made from the seed of David according to the flesh.” The Apostle intends to declare that the matter of the Gospel is the Son of God according to two natures and according to two advents. And therefore he begins to explain at once the human nature and the first advent of the Son of God. And hence it is apparent that the Blessed Virgin, from whom Jesus was born, descended from the seed of David; otherwise it would not be true that Jesus, according to the flesh, was made from the seed of David.

¶ “Who was defined Son of God.” It should be read: “defined Son of God.” Rendering word for word. And on account of heretics, the very text of St. Paul (not interpreters) must be expounded. For Arians and the like say: Paul says thus, whatever expositors may interpret. The literal sense, therefore, is that the one made according to the flesh from the seed of David is defined, determined, decreed Son of God. And note well that he does not say “made Son of God,” but “defined Son of God.” For the Son of God was made the Son of man, when the Word was made flesh from the seed of David; and the Son of man, made from the seed of David, was defined Son of God. For it is declared thereby that it has been decreed and determined that the Son of man is the Son of God. By this the error is also excluded of those who say there are two hypostases in Christ, one of the Son of God and the other of the Son of man. For if there were two hypostases, it would be false that the Son of man was defined Son of God. And these things hold, if one makes a punctuation in this sentence. For to me it seems, according to the plain literal sense, that no sort of punctuation should be made there; rather, the sense should be continued with what follows, with the construction hanging.

¶ “In power.” “Power” is not taken here as distinguished from vice, but as distinguished from weakness or impotence. And the sense is: in authority or might.

¶ “According to the Spirit.” The same preposition interpreted above as “according to” (when it was said “according to the flesh”) and

CHAPTER ONE

placed at the beginning of the Gospels (when it is said “according to Matthew” or “according to John”) is found here also; and therefore “according to the Spirit” fits very well.

¶ “Of sanctification, by the resurrection of the dead.” He does not say “by his resurrection from the dead,” but “by the resurrection of the dead,” so that we may understand that he speaks of the state arising from the general resurrection of the dead. The literal sense, therefore, is: the second advent of Christ is defined in executive power—not in any sort of power, but according to the Spirit of holiness—from the resurrection of the dead. Thus the sense is not that he is defined Son of God, but that he is defined Son of God in this, namely, in power—not to create heaven or earth, but in power according to the Spirit of holiness, in power conformable to the Spirit of holiness; and holiness is not just any holiness, but that which is from the resurrection of the dead, that is, holiness fitting the state which will be from the resurrection of the dead. And that this is the sense intended by the Apostle is clear, first, from the fact that when he had said “concerning his Son,” he had already said “the Son of God,” and had signified the divine nature of the Son; therefore it was not necessary, to signify the Son’s divine nature, to say “defined Son of God,” but it was indeed necessary to declare what executive power was decreed for the Son of God in the flesh. It is clear, second, from the fact that the Son of God is omnipotent, and by the divine nature is not defined to any power, and by the human nature no power is impeded for him; and therefore it sounds ill to say that he is defined Son of God “in power,” unless it is referred to the order of the divine disposition concerning the power to be exercised in that state of resurrection. And the sense is that that Son, made from the seed of David according to the flesh, is decreed Son of God in power; that is, he is decreed to use the sonship of God in power—not the power of creating the world, not the power of violence and arms, but power consonant with the Spirit of holiness. And truly Jesus, who in the first advent appeared humble according to the flesh, is decreed to come according to divine power fitting the Spirit of holiness that will be in the state of the resurrection of

TO THE ROMANS

the dead. It could not be more briefly and at once more clearly described what power Jesus will use in the second advent, than to describe it from the authority of the Son of God and from the congruity to the Spirit of holiness that will be from the resurrection of the dead. For under this power are comprehended all actions both of justice (whether punishing or rewarding) and of the grace of the renewal of the world and the perpetual state, and so forth. And it is also clear, third, because participles of this sort (“made” and “defined”) are always referred, according to the sweetest construction of the letter, to that genitive: “concerning his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord,” that is, “concerning Jesus Christ our Lord.”

¶ “Through whom we have received grace.” He had said that he was called to the apostolate and set apart for the Gospel of God, but he had not said through whom; and therefore now he explains it. And he says “we have received,” counting himself among the other Apostles. And he says “grace,” to exclude his own merits, and to signify that through Jesus, by grace, they received salvation.

¶ “And apostleship.” Not only through him have we received things that are internal grace, but also the office of apostleship.

¶ “For obedience of faith.” The first fruit of the apostolic office is described as the spreading of the obedience of faith; that is, that the Gentiles obey the faith. For to this they were sent, and for this the Apostles labored: that they might bring in the obedience of faith, that they might render men obedient to faith, that they might bring “every intellect into captivity unto the obedience of Christ.”

¶ “Among all nations.” The extent of the fruit is explained: not in one region, not in Africa or Asia, but among all nations.

¶ “For his name.” The end both of the apostolic office and of the fruit of the nations’ obedience is described: not one’s own name, not the fame or glory of Paul and the Apostles, but the knowledge and glory of Christ.

¶ “Among whom are you also called of Jesus Christ.” “Called” is not a participle but a noun, and it does not signify “named,” but “summoned” or “called.” And the sense is: among those nations you also

CHAPTER ONE

are called to the fellowship of Jesus Christ. Perhaps the genitive “of Jesus Christ” is referred to “obedience of faith,” so that the sense is: for obedience of the faith of Jesus Christ among all nations, among whom you also are called.

¶ “To all who are at Rome.” Behold to whom he writes. He does not say “to all Romans,” but “to all who are at Rome,” lest he seem to write to Romans scattered throughout the world; rather, he makes it clear that he writes to the Church which was in the place of the city of Rome (whether it consisted of Romans or of foreigners).

¶ “Beloved of God.” By two conditions he distinguishes those to whom he writes from the others who were at Rome. One is divine love, by which God loves them, willing for them so great a good as eternal beatitude. And “beloved” is not a participle but a noun.

¶ “Called saints.” That is, summoned to holiness. For “called” is a noun signifying, as above, so that they may understand that those whom God loves, he also calls to holiness, not to the uncleanness of morals, to errors of superstitions, and so forth.

¶ “Grace to you and peace.” Behold the salutation containing the supreme gifts, the first and the last. Grace is the reason for all gifts: it is a benefaction without merits; peace is the fruit of all graces.

¶ “From God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.” “Our” is superfluous. “Jesus Christ.” Lest he seem to be imploring grace or peace from man, he adds “from God.” And lest he signify that something difficult is to be obtained from God, he adds “our Father,” so that, when the fatherly affection in God is heard, the benefaction may be judged easy. And that he may signify that all things are done together by God and by Jesus Christ, he added “and the Lord Jesus Christ.”

¶ “First indeed.” After the salutation he begins the narration; but before he comes to the matter of the Epistle he prefaces a description of himself toward those who are at Rome. For in the salutation, describing the person who salutes, he had described himself in relation to all nations; now, consequently, he describes himself specifically toward those

TO THE ROMANS

who are at Rome, to whom he writes. And therefore he says “first,” that is, before he comes to the matter of the Epistle.

¶ “I give thanks.” By five actions he describes himself toward them. The first is to give thanks to God, and this regards the divine gifts already conferred upon them.

¶ “To my God.” Thus he describes himself toward those who are at Rome, so that he simultaneously shows what he is like toward God. And he mixes this in for their benefit: for by saying “to my God,” he signifies that God is his by faith, hope, and charity.

¶ “Through Jesus Christ.” Just as Jesus Christ is mediator when gifts are conferred by God on men, so he is mediator in the giving of thanks. Hence the Church also always adds to her prayers, “through our Lord Jesus Christ.” For the merits of Jesus Christ must be acknowledged in thanksgiving, since they obtain for us the conferral of divine gifts.

¶ “For all of you.” That is, in your place, as reckoning the gifts conferred upon you as his own; or “for all of you beloved of God and called saints,” as the matter of thanksgiving.

¶ “Because your faith is proclaimed in the whole world.” This reason fits the second sense better: therefore I give thanks to God for you all, as for God’s gifts, because your faith is proclaimed in the whole world, because the fragrance of so great a gift breathes through the whole world, and is useful to the whole world, as provoking faith from every side. But the first sense is better served if one reads that “your faith is proclaimed in the whole world,” for then he explains that the matter of his thanksgiving is the fame of their faith, useful to the whole world. For Rome at that time was the head of the world, and therefore the fame of the Christian faith of those at Rome was spread to all and was useful to all.

¶ “For God is my witness.” By this he describes himself by a second action: that he always, in particular, prays for his coming to them. And for this—whether narratively or by invocation—he brings forward God as witness, who alone can be witness of this action. And if one were to render word for word, it would be apparent that Paul says these things

CHAPTER ONE

narratively: it should be read “for God is my witness,” where he narrates God as witness, not invokes; and therefore he does not swear.

¶ “Whom I serve.” The Greek term signifies that special service which is rendered to God alone, which theologians commonly call the worship of adoration; but we in Latin lack a proper word. And here again Paul mingles what he himself is like before God.

¶ “In my spirit.” In distinction from those who serve God with only an outward service.

¶ “In the Gospel of his Son.” Behold the outward act in which he serves from the depths of his heart: namely, the good proclamation of the Son of God, with respect to the thing proclaimed.

¶ “That without ceasing I make mention of you in my prayers.” Note that he does not say absolutely “without ceasing,” but “in my prayers,” to signify that whenever he prayed, he never ceased to make mention of those at Rome.

¶ “Asking”—that is, “begging.” Behold the second action.

¶ “If somehow at last, at some time.” This heaping up of adverbs signifies a continuing affection.

¶ “That I may have a prosperous journey, by the will of God, to come to you.” The Apostle qualifies his petition, to be fulfilled according to the will of God, who disposes all things sweetly.

¶ “For I long to see you.” Behold the third action.

¶ “That I may impart to you some spiritual gift.” And therefore it should be read: “that I may impart to you some spiritual gift.” For he did not vainly desire to see them, but in order to communicate to them some spiritual gift, of knowledge pertaining to faith and morals, and so forth.

¶ “To strengthen you.” Thanksgiving regards benefits already received; prayer and the desire of seeing them regards benefits of firmness to be received.

¶ “That is, to be consoled together among you through that faith which is mutual, yours and mine.” Paul spares his own fruit, lest those at Rome be offended as though he presumptuously and arrogantly claimed for himself the office of strengthening them. Lest, then, at the beginning

TO THE ROMANS

of the Epistle he incur this stumbling block when he had said “to strengthen you,” he moderates it by adding his own consolation in them through mutual faith. Yet he does not diminish what he had said about strengthening, because their very strengthening would be matter of Paul’s consolation. And because “to be consoled” is taken in a passive signification, which Latin lacks, it would have to be read “to receive consolation.”

¶ “But I do not want you to be ignorant, brethren, that I often proposed to come to you, and was prevented until now.” He adds the fourth action, namely, that he proposed to go to them.

¶ “That I might have some fruit among you also, just as among the other nations.” This clause, as to the sense, must be joined with “I often proposed to come to you.” For he declares for what end: namely, that he might have some fruit among you just as among the other nations. For between these there is inserted the clause “and I was prevented until now.” But “prevented” is to be understood as by other apostolic occupations.

¶ “To Greeks and to barbarians, to the wise and to the unwise, I am a debtor.” He explains the impediments preventing him from this, from the fact that by the office of apostleship laid upon him he is a debtor to all. He describes all men under two differences. One is of language, saying “to Greeks and to barbarians.” For the Greek tongue at that time was as it were the common tongue for all; and therefore he distinguishes barbarians, who are not understood, over against Greeks, so as to comprehend all nations, both those sharing the language and those not sharing it. The other difference is of mind, saying “to the wise and to the unwise,” that is, to the learned and the unlearned. Whether you understand this of philosophical learning, moral learning, and the like, or of the learning of true wisdom according to God, to both he was a debtor as an apostle.

¶ “So, as much as is in me.” Supply: “there is.” For the Apostle infers from the foregoing (that without ceasing he prays, that he desires to see them, that he often proposed and was prevented until now) his

CHAPTER ONE

fifth action toward those at Rome: “as much as is in me,” that is, as much as is on my part.

¶ “I am ready to preach the Gospel also to you who are at Rome.” Many think “ready” should be taken substantively, as “readiness,” so that the sense is: as much as is in me, readiness is present. But it matters little whether it is read adjectively or substantively. For the sense is that, as much as is in me, I am prepared to preach the Gospel even to you who are at Rome. Thus this fifth “action” is rather a disposition toward acting than an action, for he had not yet preached to them.

¶ “For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ.” The words “of Christ” are lacking in the text. He gives the reason for his readiness by excluding an internal impediment. For someone could perhaps count among impediments internal passions, which most of all remove readiness. And because the Gospel of Christ is the Gospel of the Crucified (who is to the Jews a scandal, and to the Gentiles foolishness), the passion of shame holds the chief place in impeding readiness to preach Christ. For to preach things that are judged foolish and shameful has annexed to it the fear of passive reproach, which is called shame. And therefore Paul, professing himself ready to preach Christ even at Rome, professes that the impediment of shame is excluded from him, so that he is understood to have been prevented only by external impediments.

¶ “For it is the power of God.” Here the Epistle properly begins as to its proper matter; and in these words, comprehending the whole matter of the Epistle, he proposes it. But first note the way by which Paul enters the matter of the Epistle: it is artful. He began from the beginning by describing the person of the one saluting; that he is an apostle called and set apart for the Gospel of Christ; then, describing himself specifically toward those at Rome, he declared his desire, his prayer, his proposal, and finally his readiness for the Gospel of Christ, so that from this he might enter into the matter of the Gospel of this Epistle, that is, into the thing evangelized, into the thing announced by the Gospel, which is the matter of this Epistle. Hence immediately he adds the

TO THE ROMANS

conjunction “for,” to signify that the thing announced by the Gospel excludes all shame.

¶ When it is said “for it is power,” and without doubt “the Gospel” is understood (for the sense is: “the Gospel is power”), understand “Gospel” according to the thing evangelized, according to the thing announced by the Gospel. And “power” is taken for authority or might, as opposed to weakness or impotence, and not as “virtue” is distinguished from vice. Nor does he say “it is powerful,” but “it is power,” so that we may understand that the thing announced by the Gospel is not only powerful but is power itself—not of man, not of the heavens or angels, but of God.

¶ “For salvation.” Behold to what the evangelical power is ordered: to salvation. Truly the Son came into the world that he might save the world; truly the evangelical power tends to salvation, not to perdition. For whoever perish, perish from themselves; but whoever is saved, is saved by this power alone.

¶ “To everyone who believes.” Without any exception (of condition, sex, quality, and so forth) it is said “to everyone who believes.” Faith alone is required for salvation.

¶ “To the Jew first, and to the Greek.” The conjunction is lacking; it should be “and first and to the Greek.” The execution of salvation is described with a certain order: namely, that it began in the nation of the Jews. And this was evident to sense: for Jesus Christ preached personally to the Jews; and the Apostles first preached to the Jews; and therefore the first believers were Jews: namely, the Apostles themselves and an innumerable multitude. And because immediately the Greeks followed the faith of the Jews, therefore he says “to the Jew first and to the Greek.”

¶ Thus a twofold order of execution is signified: one between the Jews and Greeks on the one hand and the remaining nations on the other; the other between the Jew and the Greek among themselves. And this latter order is signified by the very order of naming “Jew” and “Greek”; the former is signified both by the adverb “first” and by the doubled conjunction. For he does not say “to the Jew first and then to the

CHAPTER ONE

Greek,” which would signify only an order between the Jew and the Greek; rather he says “to the Jew first and to the Greek,” clearly comprehending both under “first,” and by the doubled conjunction: “to the Jew first and to the Greek,” that is, first both to the Jew and to the Greek. For when he had said “for salvation to everyone who believes,” he adds that the order of execution is that it begins from both the Jew and the Greek toward all the rest. From the Jew indeed, as abounding in the faith of Abraham and the prophets; from the Greek, as seeking wisdom. And according to the order of the deed, the first nation believing after the Jews was the nation of the Greeks, in which Christians were first called by name—and it is clear that this is a Greek name. And although this was the order of execution, the literal sense by the name “Greek” intends “Gentile,” named from “Greek” for the stated reason: namely, because the salvation of the Gentiles began from the Greek nation. And the literal order of execution between Jew and Greek, that is, Gentile, is signified: because Paul proposes here what he later treats.

¶ For it is not clear that anywhere in this whole Epistle any special mention is made of Greeks, except where he said earlier “to Greeks and to barbarians”; but there is a special treatment later of the primacy of the salvation of the Jews with respect to the Gentiles, both in time and in dignity, as is evident from chapter 9 up to chapter 11. Therefore the literal sense is: “to the Jew first,” in time and dignity, and then “to the Greek,” that is, to the Gentile. Thus the doubled conjunction signifies that both nations are elected alike without merit; and “first” signifies the order of execution and the dignity had in this matter.

¶ “For the justice of God.” He does not say “justice,” but “the justice of God,” in distinction from human justice, from the justice of the Law, of circumcision, and of any other. And the sense is: the justice of God, that is, the justice by which a man is just before God—just, I say, not in some respect, but simply and absolutely. Just again not from justice which is the virtue toward another, but from justice as the right disposition of the whole soul, according to which, in frequent usage in sacred letters, “just” is distinguished from “unjust,” that is, good according to God, in

TO THE ROMANS

distinction from those existing in mortal sin. This justice of God (as will be declared below) is also called the justice of faith.

¶ “Is revealed in it.” That is, in it, namely, in the Gospel. For he proves that the Gospel, according to the thing announced, is a salvific power for everyone who believes, because in the Gospel the justice of God is revealed, by which men are just before God, by which men are saved.

¶ “From faith to faith.” This can be referred either to the verb “is revealed” (and the sense is: it is revealed from the faith of the Fathers of the Old Testament to the faith of the men of the New Testament), or to the noun “justice” (and the sense is: the justice of God from faith to faith, that is, from the faith of the Old Testament to the faith of the New Testament, is revealed in the Gospel). And both are true. For the Gospel of Christ proceeds from the faith of the Fathers and strengthens the faith of the Fathers, and manifests that the justice of the Fathers is the justice of that same faith. Nor is it said “from faith to faith” to signify diverse faiths, but to signify the succession of believers according to the same faith. And the revelation from faith to faith, or the revelation of justice from faith to faith, is not without mystery. For it is explained by this: that the Gospel, which was hidden in the faith of the Fathers, uncovers and sets in the open in the faith of the sons. This Paul himself accomplishes in this Epistle, as Jesus makes manifest in the Gospel.

¶ “As it is written”—in Habakkuk, chapter 2—“But the just lives by faith,” that is, “will live.” Three things are ordered in this authority of Scripture: life, justice, and faith, so that the construction is: life from justice which is from faith. And it in some manner embraces all that he had proposed. And the letter should be punctuated thus: “But the just from faith” (so that it is determined not “just from anywhere,” but “just from faith”) “is the one who will live”—life, without doubt, of eternal salvation. And by this is excluded from true life not only whoever is unjust, but also whoever is in any way just not from faith: both one who has no faith, and one who has faith yet is not just from faith—such as one who has dead faith, unformed faith.

CHAPTER ONE

¶ “For the wrath of God is revealed.” The matter of the Epistle having been proposed, he begins to treat it part by part. And first indeed he treats that clause, “for in it the justice of God is revealed,” up to chapter five, at “Therefore, having been justified by faith.” Where, for a certain acquaintance with the progress of the Epistle, know that the Apostle’s intention is to treat of evangelical grace or power. And from this he brings low both Gentiles and Jews, showing them to be equal with respect to the evangelical thing, though with many prerogatives he prefers the Jews as to manner. Hence from the beginning up to the end he interweaves certain prerogatives of the Jews.

¶ But to pursue this intention he proposed that the Gospel is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, and so forth, intending as it were to propose these as a theme, and afterwards to unfold what he proposed. Beginning therefore from the clause “for in it the justice of God is revealed,” he first declares that revelation by the revelation of the punishment of its contrary. For injustice is manifestly contrary to the justice of God. And therefore he begins from the revelation of the punishment of injustice both among Gentiles and among Jews with a like style, namely, by proposing first as it were a summary of such punishment, and then executing it part by part. The summary is that the wrath of God is revealed from heaven upon the impiety and injustice of men who detain the truth in injustice. And “wrath of God” is the vindicative justice, metaphorically named wrath.

¶ “From heaven.” This can be referred either to the vengeance, so that vengeance “from heaven” is signified, in distinction from the vengeance which God executes through men—for the wrath of God “from heaven” is the vengeance of eternal damnation—or it can be referred to the verb “is revealed,” so that what he first said, “is revealed in it” (namely, in the Gospel), now explains that the evangelical revelation is from God.

¶ “Upon every impiety and injustice.” Impiety is a species of injustice; he ascends from species to genus. But this species had to be named on account of the greatness of the crime. For impiety is contrary

TO THE ROMANS

to piety, which renders worship and duty to parents, to one's country, and to their benefactors.

¶ “Of men who detain the truth in injustice.” The cause of the impiety and injustice of such men he touches as being to detain the truth in injustice, so that from the very fact that they detain the truth in injustice, they become unjust and impious. To detain the truth in injustice is to enclose the truth known in the intellect, as it were in the chains of injustice in the will, so that they shut up the true intellect by an iniquitous will, detaining it, I say, lest it go out into affections and works conformable to the known truth. For this is properly to detain the truth in injustice, that is, to do injury to the known truth. And from this it is clear that he is not speaking of just any truth, but of the truth of divine things, to which the greatest injury is done by the very fact that it is unjustly detained lest it be known by others, lest it be venerated by affections, words, and works.

¶ “Because what is known of God is manifest in them.” Intending to prove the detention of truth, he begins by affirming that the truth of divine things is known to them. For what is not possessed cannot be detained. He begins, moreover, from a knowledge common to believers and unbelievers, because he begins the execution from the injustice of the Gentiles. And he says “what is known of God,” in distinction from those conditions of God which are unknown, such as that he is three and one, and other things of which the human intellect is in no way capable. Thus by “what is known of God” we are to understand what is known about God by the natural light of the human intellect: that he is one, the first of all, pure act, eternal, and other things of this sort.

¶ “Is manifest in them.” That is, in their inmost parts. And note well that it is said “is manifest,” against those who think that by no reasoning are those things about God demonstrated: they not only contradict philosophy, but also the apostolic text. For if it is manifest, it must be demonstrable.

¶ “For God has made it manifest to them.” He does not say “revealed,” lest he mingle in the light of grace, but says “made manifest,”

CHAPTER ONE

to signify the divine concurrence through the natural light (which is God's gift).

¶ “For the invisible things of him.” He adds the mode by which God made it manifest to them, and it is the natural mode of understanding from effects. “Invisible things,” that is, the invisible conditions of God himself. And he says “invisible things” in the plural, though earlier he had said “what is known of God” and now says “God,” because, as from the fact that that simplest thing which God is is not known by us under that one and most simple ratio but under multiplied conditions (that he is pure act, that he is immutable, that he is eternal, and the like), he says “the invisible things of God” in the plural; so too, from the fact that the whole collected knowledge we have about God is not knowledge of God (that is, of that most simple thing as it is in itself) but of God as having something of what we know about him, he said “what is known of God.” For the human intellect is naturally disposed to know a most simple thing under distinct ratios and by the mode of composite things.

¶ “From the creature of the world.” He declares in respect of whom he said “the invisible things.” For no divine condition is altogether invisible, since all are visible to God; but the conditions of God are invisible to the creature of the world—not to some creature, but to any creature. For no created intellect has by nature so great a power that it can see God; and therefore the conditions of God are said to be invisible to the creature of the world. Yet this text can be punctuated otherwise, so that “from the creature of the world” is not referred to “the invisible things of God,” but to the verb “are perceived,” so that the sense is: they “are perceived by the creature of the world.” And thus “creature of the world” is understood as limited by what follows, “being understood.” For the sense is: “by the things that are made, being understood, by the creature of the world,” so that it is not necessary to roam through every creature of the world, but only that creature whose part it is to understand. And it comprehends not only men but all creatures having intellect. For of all it is true what is said here. And thus “the invisible

TO THE ROMANS

things of God” remains infinite in meaning, because in very truth they are in themselves invisible by the natural faculty of any created intellect. Know, however, with those who point out that the Greek expression is ambiguous between “creature” and “creation,” and therefore some interpreters read “from the creation of the world.” Yet it seems to fit better to read “from the creature of the world,” because he adds “by the things that are made,” in which the creation of the world is comprehended.

¶ “By the things that are made.” Here is the mode by which divine things can be perceived by others, namely, by the things that are made. Here he openly says that the invisible things of God, which cannot be seen in themselves, can be perceived by others through the things that are made, that is, through effects made by God, as a cause is perceived through its proper effects.

¶ “Being understood.” The Greek term is of the present time, not the past; but we lack a passive participle of the present tense. He declares the mode by which, through the things that are made, the divine things are perceived. The mode is: through the things that are made being understood in the present—not sensed, not imagined, not known superficially, but penetrated by intellect. And it is like the way someone is seen by reflection in a mirror. For God shines in effects from him as in mirrors. And just as, for seeing a reflection in a mirror, the gaze must be upon the mirror, so for perceiving God through the things that are made, there is required understanding of the things made by God. And he speaks properly by using the preposition “through,” saying “through the things that are made being understood,” because properly speaking God is not perceived in made creatures as a thing is seen in a mirror; rather, through those effects, when they are understood, we ascend to perceiving the conditions of God himself, such as that he is eternal, that he is pure act, and so forth. Hence a more fitting example is when, from artifacts carefully examined, we perceive the art because the artifacts are made; and whoever perceives artifacts more keenly sees more and better of the art that made them.

CHAPTER ONE

¶ “Are perceived.” What he previously called “invisible things” he now says are “perceived through the things that are made being understood,” so that we may understand two modes of manifest knowing. One is by way of vision or intuition of the thing in itself; and with respect to this he said “invisible.” The other is by way of seeing clearly yet in another, as we see things in a mirror, as we perceive art by seeing effects from the art; and with respect to this he says “are perceived.” If you ask how angels and other intelligences higher than ours perceive God through the things that are made being understood, the answer is ready: by gazing upon themselves, intelligences made by God, they perceive God, speaking of the natural knowledge of which the discourse is.

¶ “His everlasting power and divinity.” It should be read: “and his power and divinity.” It did not suffice for Paul to say in general that the invisible things of God have been perceived, but he explains in particular three things: everlastingness, power, and divinity. And he denominates both power and divinity as everlasting, in distinction from new gods or any new power. But more formally the adjective “everlasting” may be understood to determine only “power,” so that three things about God known are explained: first, in general, the invisible things of God, namely, that he is incorporeal, immaterial, one, living, understanding, blessed in himself; then in particular, his everlasting power as authority, namely, that it is neither exhausted by acting, and that it can make everlasting effects; and finally his essence, by saying “and divinity.” This he therefore places last, because from the other conditions and from the everlasting power it becomes known to us. It is manifest indeed as to the fact that he is, and as to many negative and positive conditions; yet from all of these joined together it is not known what he is, properly speaking. Nor is this surprising: for to know what God is is natural to God alone, because to see God in himself is natural to God alone; but to angels and to us it is granted by natural power only to perceive God through effects.

¶ And he distinguished between the power of God and the divinity: not because God’s power and God’s divinity are two things, but for the reason stated above, because through multiplied ratios that one

TO THE ROMANS

and most simple thing which is God and any condition of his (power, wisdom, and so forth) becomes known to us. Therefore the divinity of God is perceived because it is perceived that he is pure act, free from all potentiality, from which no other being is exempt; that he is *ipsum esse*, not by any participation in being, but by essence, subsisting in himself, upon whom depends the whole universe of beings.

¶ “So that they are inexcusable.” And the sense is: so that they are inexcusable in this which is added below.

¶ “Because, although they knew God, they did not glorify him as God.” Here is that in which they are rendered inexcusable; here is how they detain the truth in injustice: having in the intellect the knowledge, and not glorifying him as God. And this negation of glorification concerns both words of praise and deeds of sacrifices and worship.

¶ “Nor did they give thanks.” This is the second negation, of thanksgiving. For knowing of God the highest excellence, they were bound to glorify him; and knowing his most liberal beneficence toward all, they were bound to give thanks.

¶ “But they became vain.” That is, “they were made vain.” Not only did they sin by omission, but also by interior works of intention and affection. For to be made vain is to have become devoted to vain things, to frivolous things, such as fame, honor, and human glory, with other transitory things. For by this is signified the sin of philosophers, by which they were affected toward human glory and similar frivolities.

¶ “In their thoughts.” The matter of their affection toward vain things is their reasonings and the sharp reflections of their minds. As if he had said more openly: the acuteness of their intellect, by which they ascended to knowledge of God, was for them matter of delight in human glory; and from that by which they ought to have glorified God and given thanks, from that they fell into their own vanity.

¶ “And their foolish heart was darkened.” From the fault both of omitting the glorification of God and thanksgiving, and of the admitted affection toward their own glory, the punishment of the darkening of the heart is described. And he calls their heart foolish by reason of both

CHAPTER ONE

faults, so that the sense is: and their heart, foolish—namely, their inmost heart, foolish in not glorifying and not giving thanks, and in being affected toward vain things (for foolishness is contrary to wisdom, which judges rightly according to the ultimate end, according to the supreme cause which is God)—was darkened, incurring as punishment darkening, the privation of light by which it might have returned to sobriety from its fault. And he said this to remove men's wonder at such an iniquitous detention of truth among philosophers. For wonder is removed from this, that by the just judgment of God their inmost part was darkened, because, after they denied to God glorification and thanksgiving out of affection for their own glory, they were punished.

¶ “Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.” Two particles are superfluous: “for” and “themselves.” But the interpreter was compelled to add “themselves” to express the sense. Nor is it speech about just any “saying,” but about a saying by profession. For Paul declares what he had said, “they became vain in their thoughts,” by saying: professing themselves to be wise, so that we may understand that their thoughts were thoughts of that wisdom which they professed.

¶ “They became fools.” That is, they fell into the contrary of true wisdom, disposing things contrary to what true wisdom required to be disposed; and these contraries he adds.

¶ “And they exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God.” Behold the actions of foolishness. And the sense is: they exchanged the glory due to the incorruptible God.

¶ “In the likeness of the image of corruptible man, and of birds and four-footed beasts and serpents.” The phrase should be read “in the likeness,” not “into the likeness.” For the term to which of the change is not signified; the sense is not that they exchanged the glory due to God into a likeness, as into the term into which the glory of God was changed. Rather, the change of the glory due to God away from its term is signified in the text, and the likeness is described as the occasion concurring with the change, namely, as the thing in which the change of glory due to God took its occasion. For the plain literal sense is that, by worshiping images,

TO THE ROMANS

whether of men or animals, they exchanged the glory due to God. And truly it was so: for what philosophers did not fashion some representation of God and of God's glory in images of men and animals? Yet because they caused these images to be worshiped or worshiped them, they exchanged the glory due to God. They exchanged it both by subtracting it, since thus the glory due to God is taken away from the human race, and by bestowing upon another the glory due to God, for the glory of sacrifices is due to God alone.

¶ “Of the image.” To explain what likeness he means, he adds “of the image,” so that we may understand that the discourse is of likeness by way of an image.

¶ “Of corruptible man, and of birds and four-footed beasts and serpents.” He comprehends all genera of animals under this threefold difference of instruments for progressive motion.

¶ “For this reason God gave them up.” He adds the punishment of so great a crime committed against God's glory. But when you hear that God “gave them up” to the things mentioned below, understand that he gave them up by withdrawing grace, holding them back from those desires and deeds.

¶ “To the lusts of their hearts, unto uncleanness.” That is, “in the concupiscences of their hearts, unto uncleanness.” Behold a fitting punishment. For they had been raised up to the knowledge of God and were unwilling to dispose themselves accordingly; therefore they deserved to be subjected to the sensitive part. For it is fitting that those who were unwilling to use the loftiness of intellect should be subjected to the vileness and shame of the senses. And they were not abandoned in the concupiscences of their own hearts in general, but (what is worse) in those concupiscences of their own hearts which tend to uncleanness, which are the vilest. And this rightly: that those who rejected pure desires proceeding from divine knowledge should be handed over to unclean concupiscences, so as to be subjected to them. Note that, by the very manner of speaking, it is written “he gave them up in the concupiscences,” so that from this very phrase it is understood that God

CHAPTER ONE

gives them up by leaving them in their own concupiscences. And it is significantly said “of hearts,” because the wicked man does not have one heart but many, since the appetites are contrary.

¶ “So that they dishonor their bodies among themselves.” That is, “so that they afflict their bodies with shame among themselves.” He explains in outward acts what he had said “unto uncleanness,” declaring that he speaks of venereal uncleanness, and not any kind, but shameful, that is, against nature, as he will explain more. He describes it by shame, because it is truly shameful, as all nations testify. And it is added as a fitting punishment for glory withdrawn from God: that for the glory withdrawn from God, they incur shame for their own bodies. And he says “among themselves,” in distinction from the shame of this sort which is sometimes inflicted on enemies to defile them. For he signifies that they incurred this punishment so that, among friends, among fellow citizens, among their own, they would defile their bodies with such shame.

¶ “Because they exchanged the truth of God.” He accumulates crime upon crime before he explains in particular the punishment which he described in general. He had said that they exchanged the glory of God; now he adds another crime, that they exchanged the truth of God, that is, the truth known to them about God. For they could not change the truth of God in itself; but they changed the truth of God known to them.

¶ “In a lie.” That is, “in a lie.” For the construction and sense are like the earlier clause, when it was said “they exchanged the glory of God in the likeness of an image.” For the term to which is not signified: it is not said that they changed the truth into a lie; but it is said “in a lie,” that is, that by using lies they exchanged the truth of God. For by using false doctrines they exchanged the truth known about God. They exchanged it both by taking away what belongs to the divine intellect or power—for from the lies of philosophers it followed that the things truly known of God were either turned into doubt or remained unknown to others—and by inventing that what belongs properly to God belongs to others.

TO THE ROMANS

For in these lies the truth of divine things previously known was changed either into ambiguity or into negation among men.

¶ “And they worshiped and served.” Here he insinuates that the lie lay in this: that they fabricated a kind of divinity in parts of the world, whether bodily or incorporeal. And I say they fabricated, because it is plainly said “in a lie,” not “in falsity,” so that we may understand that they said this not only falsely but mendaciously, that is, deliberately: saying that creatures have something of divinity or are gods, and that worship is owed to them. And he explains two acts: one of veneration, the other of service; and the discourse is of that adoration-service which is due to God alone, and likewise of divine veneration.

¶ “To the creature rather than the Creator.” Behold another crime. Earlier he described the crime of those worshiping images of men, birds, four-footed beasts, and the like; now he describes the crime of those worshiping creatures, such as the sun, moon, the elements, demons, and the like. For both idolatries seem to have arisen from philosophers: the first from forming images of heavenly signs, such as the ram, the crab, the scales, and so forth; the second from saying that worship is owed to beneficial parts of the world, or to things animated by the soul of the world.

¶ “Passing over him who made them.” That is, with God, who made the creatures, left aside. For such a passing over completes the notion of inexcusable crime. For it would have been tolerable to venerate creatures, yet under the Creator; but to venerate them while passing over the Creator is altogether inexcusable. Note that, corresponding to the two omissions (namely, that they did not glorify him and did not give thanks), he adds two works: that they exchanged the glory in the likeness of an image, and that they exchanged the truth in a lie, serving the creature while passing over the Creator. For this latter directly opposes the thanksgiving owed to God, as the former opposes the glory owed to God.

¶ “Who is blessed.” With the blessing of praise.

¶ “For ever. Amen.” That is, truly.

CHAPTER ONE

¶ “For this reason God gave them up.” He begins to explain punishments in particular.

¶ “To passions of shame.” He calls the passions of shameful acts “passions of shame.”

¶ “For their women changed the natural use into that use which is against nature.” Understand the use of sex.

¶ “Likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their desire toward one another—men with men working shame, and receiving in themselves the recompense which was fitting for their error.” As recompense corresponds by merit in good things, so it is transferred also to evils; and the punishment which error merited is called the recompense of error. Thus, because they erred by subtracting the glory owed to God, they were punished by such shames.

¶ “And as they did not approve to have God in knowledge.” That is: and as they did not approve by deeds the God known to them; they did not approve by deeds so great a benefit, that they had God in their knowledge; which is the same as that they did not give thanks to God, that they neglected so great a benefit.

¶ “God gave them up to a reprobate mind.” That is, “to a reprobate mind.” He declares the congruity of the punishment mentioned below: that just as they, having knowledge of God, did not use it by approving it by deeds, so God gave them up to a reprobate mind, that is, a mind worthy of reprobation, that is, choosing reprobate things. For it is fitting that, as they reprobated the God known to them, so they incur a reprobate mind.

¶ “To do those things which are not fitting.” The reprobate mind is declared in outward acts.

¶ “Filled with every injustice.” That is, every iniquity. The interpreter left these accusatives to be constructed after the pronoun “them.”

¶ “Malice, fornication.” There is a transposition of words, for in the text “fornication” is named first and then “malice.”

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “Avarice.” Not properly as opposed to liberality, but as a part of injustice by which a man usurps more for himself than is fitting by right.

¶ “Wickedness.” That is, vice, or viciousness.

¶ “Full of envy, murders.” That is, slaughter.

¶ “Contention, deceit, malignity.” That is, bad habit.

¶ “Whisperers, detractors, hateful to God.” That is, haters of God.

¶ “Contumelious.” Or rather, injurious.

¶ “Proud, haughty.” Or rather, boastful.

¶ “Inventors of evils, disobedient to parents, senseless, without order, without affection.” That is, without the affection of love.

¶ “Without covenant.” That is, covenant-breakers.

¶ “Without mercy.”

¶ “Who, knowing the justice of God, did not understand that those who do such things are worthy of death—not only those who do them, but also those who consent to those who do them.” The letter is corrupted in the scan, and the sense expressed by the Apostle is not present as printed there. It ought to be read thus: “Who, knowing the justice of God—that those who do such things are worthy of death—nevertheless not only do these things worthy of death, but also consent to those who do them.” Where the plain sense of the letter is that these men, knowing the justice of God—namely, that those who do the aforesaid things are worthy of death—nonetheless not only themselves do these death-worthy evils, but also consent to others doing the same death-worthy things. And here, from two heads, the crime of these philosophers is aggravated: first, from the fact that they knew, according to divine justice, that those who do such things are worthy of death; second, from the fact that they were brought not only to do these evils, but went so far astray as to consent that others do similar things. For it would have been a lesser evil if they themselves had perpetrated these evils yet had rebuked others doing them. But when they not only do them but also consent to others, they become as though teaching that these things are lawful; and thus they draw the human race with themselves into such vices as though they were lawful.

CHAPTER TWO

CHAPTER II

¶ From the fact that, while professing themselves to be wise, they not only do such things but also consent to others that they may do deeds worthy of death, the Apostle makes plain that the whole human race is infected. Hence he infers that every man who judges is inexcusable; otherwise he would not infer this with a causal preposition, saying, “for this reason.” And it is indeed reasonable that, if even the wise are evil—not only those doing evil things, but also those approving the evil deeds of others—then all have been evil. And for this reason every man who judges another is rendered inexcusable. Therefore, making an apostrophe to every man discharging the office of judge, he says: “For this reason you are inexcusable,” and so forth.

¶ Here note that, since the Apostle, by that clause “for the righteousness of God is revealed in it,” had, by opposition (namely, to unrighteousness), proposed summarily that the wrath of God is revealed upon all impiety and unrighteousness of those men who suppress the truth in unrighteousness, and up to this point, executing this by parts, had declared in those who profess wisdom in what way they suppress the truth in unrighteousness and by what wrath of God they were punished, now consequently he declares the same in judges. For after the wise of the world, judges of the earth hold the first place. And therefore, just as he said the wise are inexcusable from their own wisdom compared with their works, so he convicts judges of being inexcusable from their own judgment compared with their deeds. For these judges too suppress the truth they know in unrighteousness, when they use that truth to judge others while themselves remaining in the unrighteousness of their own deeds.

¶ “For in that you judge another, you condemn yourself.” That is, the very act of judgment by which you judge another is your condemnation—not formally, but virtually, because it contains your own

TO THE ROMANS

condemnation. And that this is true he proves: "For you who judge do the same things." That is, you who judge do the same things as the guilty person judged by you did. From this it clearly follows that the sentence against him contains your condemnation, that is, the sentence or penalty you deserve. For if you, being an adulterer, judge another adulterer, that judgment contains the penalty you deserve.

¶ But here a question arises: from what is it that the Apostle calls the judge who does similar things to those he judges "inexcusable"? For if it is from impenitence, it would seem to follow that others are excusable with respect to impenitence. But if it is a new fault from the fact that he judges while existing in a similar crime, it would follow that a judge, however much he judges an adulterer by office and justly, if he himself had committed adultery, would by doing justice sin anew—which seems harsh. The solution is that he is inexcusable with respect to the license of his crimes. For from the fact that he judges an adulterer, he is rendered altogether inexcusable from alleging that he was deceived by the wise, thinking it to be lawful; for by judging another, he also says of himself that he is worthy of a like punishment. And this is the difference between the judge and others: that the judge, by judging, has excluded from himself every excuse, but others who do not judge do not exclude from themselves every excuse. And with this he is also rendered inexcusable with respect to a new fault which he contracts by judging while persevering in the same crime. Hence Paul uses the verb of the present tense, saying: "For you do the same things, you who judge." Nor is this harsh: for if it is disgraceful for a teacher, when he reproves a fault, to be himself in that fault, much more disgraceful is it for a judge. Nor should you therefore infer a new mortal sin; for not every fault is a mortal sin.

¶ "For we know that the judgment of God is." Lest any judge be able to object that he is exempt from laws and the penalties of laws, and therefore the same account is not to be made of him as of the subject, and for that reason that, when judging a subject, he does not condemn himself because there is one account for himself and another for the subject: to remove, I say, this sort of exception, he gives the reason for

CHAPTER TWO

what he had said from the certainty of the divine judgment against all who do such things, whether they be judges or subjects: “According to truth against those who do such things.” Human judgments are according to power and subjection, and therefore princes remain uncondemned. But the judgment of God is according to the truth of merits; and therefore, since judges truly have merits of condemnation, the judgment of God remains against them. And he says these things not only to give the reason for what was said, but also to manifest divine vengeance against judges, just as he had manifested the same against the wise.

¶ “But do you suppose this, O man, who judge those who do such things and do them yourself, that you will escape the judgment of God?” The difference between vengeance against the wise and vengeance against judges is that the former is inflicted even in the present life (as is clear from what has been said above), but the latter is deferred to the future life; and therefore, from two heads (namely, on the part of the intellect or on the part of the will) he teaches that the delay of divine vengeance is not to be despised. And beginning from the intellect, he says: “But do you suppose this,” not believing that after death there will be a divine judgment—which is the sin of unbelief. For this is the first root by which a judge promises himself impunity.

¶ “Or do you despise the riches of his goodness,” that is, of his kindness? The other root regards the will, despising, holding for nothing, the riches, that is, the abundance, the great store, of kindness, while God delays to punish and nevertheless continually pours forth upon men, although evil, abundant fruits of kindly beneficence, fruitful of goods. “And of patience,” that is, of tolerance with respect to our evils which we have committed. “And of longanimity,” in long drawing out vengeance. For we experience these three in God with respect to sinners in the present life.

¶ “Do you despise, not knowing?” It should not be read “not knowing,” but “not recognizing.” “That the kindness of God”—continually fruitful of goods—“leads you to repentance,” that is, provokes you.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “But according to your hardness.” Hard is that which does not yield to what touches it; and it is transferred to the soul, so that a man is called hard who, provoked by such kindness, is not softened, does not yield to the divine provocation. And he intends by this to declare that the delay of vengeance on God’s part is for the good of sinners, that they may be provoked to repentance; but by abuse, on the part of impenitent men, it is unto an accumulation of punishment.

¶ “And your impenitent heart.” If one must render word for word, it should be read “and an impenitible heart,” so that “hard” is said in relation to the divine provocation, but “impenitible” in relation to evil deeds: so that not only does he not repent, but he is so alien from repentance that he cannot repent. This appears in those who persevere obstinately. Yet do not by this understand that the hands of divine grace are bound; rather, it signifies a most evil disposition of hardness.

¶ “You store up.” The translator left a Greek-derived expression, though he could have said in Latin “you lay up.” “For yourself wrath.” To explain that a man accumulates evil of punishment not for the species but for himself, it is called “wrath.”

¶ “In the day of wrath.” He explains the time of vengeance from three things. First from wrath, saying “in the day of wrath,” that is, in the day of vindictive justice without mercy. “And of revelation.” Behold the second: that is, of disclosure and bringing into the open whatever crimes were hidden. For this is the second condition of that day. “And of the just judgment.” The “and” is missing; it must be read: “And of the just judgment of God.” The third condition of that day is the just divine judgment: that is, not according to what is alleged and proved, but according to the justice of God. Hence, as declaring this, he subjoins: “Who will render to each according to his works.” This is the just judgment of God. And note that Paul, in his manner, explains by parts what he had said summarily: “He will render to each according to his works.”

¶ “To those indeed who according to patience of good work.” Patience is not said of good work objectively (since the object of patience

CHAPTER TWO

is not good but evil), but causally: that is, by reason of good work, as distinguished from patience by reason of an evil work, for example theft, adultery, and the like. For the Apostle describes those patient in evils by reason of good work, so that he includes in them both parts: namely, to do good works, and to suffer evils for the sake of the good work. From these two parts the perfection of the Christian life is constituted; the life of the elect is constituted.

¶ “Seeking glory and honor and incorruption.” Otherwise the relative pronoun “who” would lack a verb to which it might be referred. And the plain sense is that to those who, according to patience of good work, seek glory with God, and heavenly honor, and the future incorruption of the flesh in the resurrection, he will render “eternal life.”

¶ “Eternal life.” This accusative is construed with the preceding verb “will render,” placed before. Thus the sense is: he will render eternal life to those who seek, and so forth.

¶ “But to those who are of contention.” Behold the second part. Just as he described those doing good from all the parts, so now he describes those doing evil from all the manifest parts of an evil work. For he describes them from three things: namely, from the fact that they do not adhere to truth, from the fact that they adhere to unrighteousness, and from contention by which outwardly they fight against truth, so that from these extremes—those indeed in good work, these in evil work—we may understand the rest. “Those who are of contention” are those who, according to their disposition, consist in this, that they contend against evangelical truth, as though their standing were founded upon contention.

¶ “And who do not obey the truth”—which is the sin of omission in a most necessary matter. “But obey unrighteousness,” or injustice—which is the sin of a manifest iniquitous work.

¶ “Wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish.” Supply: “shall be” after this life. And the first two are taken on the part of divine justice: indignation indeed signifies the censure that holds them unworthy of divine fellowship; wrath signifies punitive justice itself. The other two

TO THE ROMANS

touch the quality of the judgment or punishment; for “tribulation” explains either the subtlety of the examination by likeness to pressing, or punishment by likeness to those pressed and placed in local narrowness. For from these bodily likenesses Paul describes the punishments of hell, so that we may think that souls there are tormented as if in anguish and as if under pressure—neither of which consumes and yet it torments.

¶ “Upon every soul of man that works evil.” He had said two things: one is “to each,” the other “according to his works.” And he declared “according to works,” both good and evil; it remained that he should declare “to each.” And therefore he now declares that, saying “upon every soul,” that is, against every soul, without any exception. And he says “soul,” so that we may understand that the resurrection of bodies is not awaited for the punishment of those doing evil.

¶ “Of the Jew first, and also of the Greek.” As evangelical salvation was first given to the Jew and the Greek, so vengeance is first given to the Jew and the Greek who do evil. And “first” seems to signify not the order of execution but the order of degree, as if it were said “most especially” both of the Jew and of the Greek: so that those who received the gift first may be punished more gravely as being more ungrateful.

¶ “But glory and honor and peace to every one that works good.” Just as he described vengeance for each who works evil, so he describes reward for each who works good, with the same addition preserved: “to the Jew first and also to the Greek,” so that we may understand a like rule of vengeance and reward with respect to each, and especially with respect to Jew and Greek.

¶ “For there is no acceptance of persons with God.” He gives the reason for the whole judgment described (namely, “he will render to each according to his works”), because there is no acceptance of persons with God. Consider that he speaks of God as judge insofar as He is judge, not insofar as He is giver, but insofar as He renders to each his due. Acceptance of persons is a vice contrary to justice, and it has no place in liberal gifts. And therefore Paul, speaking of judgment, says that He will render to each according to his works because there is no acceptance of

CHAPTER TWO

persons with God, or no respect of persons, as the Greek text sounds. And it is called acceptance or respect of persons because “person” is opposed to “cause”: so that the gaze of the judge is carried not to the meritorious cause, but to the person; and therefore it is a crime, corrupting judgment, which ought to regard only the merits of the cause.

¶ “For as many as have sinned without the law.” Paul intends further to establish the doctrine of this chapter, in which he said that God will render to each according to his works, to which he had brought the reason because there is no respect of persons with God. For he now proves this last statement from the fact that “as many as have sinned without the law,” that is, have sinned without offense against the written law from Moses, “without the law shall perish,” that is, without imputation that they have transgressed the written law, they shall perish in the divine judgment. “And as many as have sinned in the law,” that is, by sinning have offended against the written law of Moses, “shall be judged by the law,” that is, shall be judged also by the demerit of transgressing the law. And he intends directly through this difference that the divine judgment will be according to the merits of works and without any respect of persons: to such an extent that Gentiles not subject to the law of Moses, sinning, shall not be punished because they transgressed the law, and Israelites subject to the law of Moses, sinning, shall be punished for transgression of the law. From this it is clear that there is no respect of persons in the divine judgment, but He will render to each according to merits.

¶ “For not the hearers of the law are just with God.” The reason of the context can be taken in two ways. One is according to the words of the letter: so that a reason is given for what was said last, namely, “and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law”; for a reason is given for this from the fact that it is not enough to hear the law, but one must keep it. And according to this context, the following doctrine concerning the justice of the Gentiles slips in on occasion of this proof. The other account of the context regards what is said implicitly. For when it was said, “as many as have sinned without the law shall perish without

TO THE ROMANS

the law,” the contrary was also signified at once, namely, that as many as, without the law, have done good works shall be justified without the merit of the law; and likewise, when it was said, “and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law,” the contrary of that was also signified, namely, that as many as in the law have worked well shall be justified by the merit of the law; for contraries have the same knowledge. Thus, when it is now added, “for not the hearers of the law,” the reason of the merit of deeds is explained, which is Paul’s principal intention. But it matters little by which way the text is introduced, for the sense always returns to the same: that with God the hearing of the law is not weighed, but the doing; and therefore it is not the person hearing the law that is weighed, but the deed. And thus the reason is had both for the judgment of those who have sinned in the law and for the judgment common to all according to deeds.

¶ “But the doers of the law shall be justified.” Here there would be a great question against the doctrine of the same Apostle, if the account of the matter about which the discourse is were not held; for expressly later he will condemn those who say that men are justified by the works of the law, the contrary of which this letter seems to sound. But the question ceases by seeing that here he treats of the divine judgment rendering to each according to his works; and therefore he does not treat of merits absolutely, but of the merit of works. But it is evident that, speaking of the merit of works, it is most true to say that “the doers of the law shall be justified with God,” understanding “so far as depends upon the nature of works.” Nor is the merit of faith excluded by this, which surpasses the merit of work. Now the doers of the law are called not the composers of the law, but those exercising in deeds the things that are of the law, whether they know the written law or not.

¶ “For when the Gentiles.” Note, prudent reader, that the text now proceeds by adding the conjunction “for” a fourth time, so that we may understand that the progress is always made by giving the reason of the reason, and that we may perceive that the discourse always stands in the same matter. He therefore proves that “the doers of the law shall be

CHAPTER TWO

justified with God” from the fact that Gentiles doing the works of the law shall be justified with God. Here one may behold Paul’s art: while at once declaring the matter proposed and the offices of the one expounding, now depressing and now raising up both Gentiles and Jews. For since he could have declared that the doers of the law shall be justified from the works of many of the Old Testament, he chose deliberately to declare this from the works of Gentiles: so that, because he had already depressed the Gentiles (both in the wise, extending even to women, and in judges), he might now raise them up. Yet an even higher reason of this art is that he might show the justices of the Mosaic law to be nothing but justices of works, from this very fact that they can be done by Gentiles who have neither law nor circumcision.

¶ “Who do not have the law,” namely the written law of Moses, supply: “as law,” that is, since they are not subject to the law of Moses; for the law of Moses was not given to the whole human race, but to Israelites only, according to that: “He has not done so for every nation.” “Naturally,” that is, without the aid of the law, by the natural light of reason, “they do the things that are of the law.” He does not say that they do all the things that are of the law, but indefinitely “the things that are of the law,” so that we may understand that he speaks of moral matters that become known by the light of nature, not of the ceremonial or judicial precepts of the law. Therefore by “the things that are of the law” understand not only to honor parents, not to steal, not to commit adultery, and the like, but also to worship the one God and to revere His name. For these are morals that are of the law; these are what the nations do by the natural light.

¶ And note well that it is one thing to do the things that are of the law, and another to do meritoriously the things that are of the law. The Apostle says the former and does not say the latter. For the former signifies keeping the moral precepts as to the substance of the act; the latter adds keeping them as to the mode of acting, and adds a mode exceeding the powers of the natural light and of human ability. Again note that the Apostle does not say, even of morals (which become known

TO THE ROMANS

by the natural light), “all,” but he says “the things.” And this must be weighed because naturally to do all moral things that are of the law is of a sound man—such as man is not constituted in natural things after the fall of nature in the first parent; but naturally to do some moral things that are of the law befits even a weak man—such as man is after the fall of the first parent. Let these things be noted on account of the questions of theologians arising from this text. For from this it is had neither that they did meritoriously with respect to eternal life, nor that the Gentiles naturally did all morals, although they naturally did certain particular things that are of the law. For in this they were equal to the Jews insofar as it depended on the law.

¶ “Such, not having the law.” The construction is from what is signified, passing over to particular Gentile men, so that we may understand from this an exception of certain particulars from the genus of the Gentiles previously condemned. “They are a law to themselves.” Lacking the written law teaching moral precepts, they themselves, according to the natural light, supply for themselves the place of a law, insofar as they use natural right reason as the rule of their affections and their operations.

¶ “Who show the work of the law written in their hearts.” That is, who show by deeds and words the work of the law (namely, not to steal, not to commit adultery, not to kill, not to swear falsely, to worship God, to honor parents, to keep faith, and the other things of this sort) as though written and fixed by natural reason in their hearts. And know that “written” is not a participle but a noun, to signify that the work of the law is shown by them as something decreed and fixed in their hearts, by likeness to a written law.

¶ “Their conscience also bearing witness to them.” For this remains to them. Outwardly by words and deeds they show the work of the law written in their hearts; inwardly, however, conscience gives witness to them of this law written in the heart. “And their thoughts mutually accusing or also defending.” Between conscience and thoughts accusing or defending there is this difference: conscience signifies the application

CHAPTER TWO

of knowledge to a deed or to something to be done, examining whether it has been done or not done, whether well or ill done, and likewise whether it is to be done or not to be done, well or ill. But thoughts accusing or defending are as it were parts converging from this side and that to the examination of conscience, as though alleging reasons for and against from natural principles. For sometimes there are defending thoughts, excusing a deed from some circumstance according to right reason; and likewise there are accusing thoughts, convicting that according to right reason it is ill done. Conscience of this sort, together with these thoughts, is a witness of the internal law.

¶ “In the day when God will judge the hidden things of men.” Understand that the merits of conscience and of thoughts accusing or defending are described in the day when God will judge the hidden things of men. For the Apostle intends that on that day the merits of consciences and of reasons accusing or excusing will be weighed in the divine judgment. And therefore he mentions “hidden things,” for such things are hidden in this life in the hearts of men.

¶ “According to my Gospel,” that is, preached by me. And he says this lest you should understand him as prophesying of the future judgment from himself. “Through Jesus Christ.” This clause is referred to the verb “will judge.” For the sense is: in the day when God, through Jesus Christ, will judge. For the Father has given all judgment to the Son of Man, and He is the one appointed by God as judge of the living and the dead. And thus it is clear that “the doers of the law” in the divine judgment “shall be justified” so far as depends upon the merits of their own works.

¶ “But if you are called a Jew.” He declared that the doers of the law are justified with God from the works of Gentiles; now he declares the same from the evil deeds of Jews, who indeed hear the law but do not act according to it, in which he at once begins to depress the Jews and charges a similar crime against them as the crime of judges. Here also note Paul’s art, that to raise up the Gentiles by depressing the Jews with respect to the divine judgment according to works, he sets forth the evil

TO THE ROMANS

works of Jews and, conversely, the good works of Gentiles: so that with respect to good works he uses Gentiles, but with respect to evil works he uses Jews. And this reasonably, because it seemed difficult to praise Gentiles for good work.

¶ He therefore shows that Jews are condemned not from profession of the law but from deeds, beginning from the prerogatives of the Jews. Among these the first is described from their lineage, saying: “Behold, you are called a Jew.” In the time of the Apostle Paul Israelites were called Jews, as also today. And therefore he uses the customary name, saying “Jew” in place of the name of the lineage: for Jews greatly magnified their lineage. And it is reasonable that the Jewish name, derived from the tribe of Judah, was extended to all the tribes of Israel from the time in which the tribe of Judah was held in such honor that it was granted to it to return to Jerusalem and rebuild the temple, and so forth, under Cyrus king of the Persians. For from then Israelites returning to the promised land seem to have been called Jews by the princes and great men of the Gentiles. And thus the Jewish name was derived for all Israelites wherever they were, so that even to this day all are called Jews. And by such a name they are also called by Gentile writers.

¶ “And you rest in the law.” You rest, I say, in understanding both concerning things to be believed and things to be done. This is the second prerogative. “And you glory in God,” as legislator and as worshiped by you. This pertains to the third prerogative. “And you know His will.” Behold the fourth, by which the knowledge of revealed things depending solely on the divine will is commended, such as the mystery of the Messiah and the like. “And you approve the more excellent things,” that is, the outstanding things, as many seem to read. “Being instructed by the law.” And this is the fifth prerogative, by which the Jew is preferred to the Gentile in this: that the Gentile approves things that are necessary, but the Jew also approves excellent things in works, which can also be called “more useful,” such as goods of supererogation, although this can also be referred to the special works of God, to the special reasons of divine works, which as outstanding matters were praised by the Jews.

CHAPTER TWO

And he says “instructed,” that is, instructed by living voice in conformity to the law, to explain knowledge of the law as to its true and spiritual sense, which was expounded by teachers by living voice, so that we may understand that the prerogative of the Jews was not only to have the written law, but also to be taught the sense of it by living voice.

¶ “You trust yourself.” After describing five prerogatives, he adds five actions which the Jew arrogates to himself from these. “That you are a guide of the blind.” The speech is metaphorical, and it corresponds to the first prerogative. For from the fact that the Jew was a Jew, he trusted and professed himself to be the guide of blind Gentiles, that is, of those unable to direct their own steps. For the Jew trusted to present himself as guide of such merely by direction: do this and do that.

¶ “A light of those who are in darkness.” The second action is the illumination of Gentiles capable of reason; hence they are described not as blind but as “in darkness,” and they need not a guide but a light. And this illumination corresponds to the second prerogative, namely, “you rest in the law,” for from the law the Jew trusts to illuminate Gentiles seeking light.

¶ “An instructor of the foolish.” The third action, which is instruction of those not mad, but deprived of wisdom, yet erring in the things belonging to wisdom about God. Hence this instruction corresponds to the third prerogative, namely, “you glory in God,” for from God known to the Jews the Jew trusts himself to be instructor of those erring in knowledge of God.

¶ “A teacher of infants,” not in body but in mind, still needing milk for discipline. And this fourth teaching action corresponds to the fourth prerogative, namely, “you know the will of God,” for from knowledge of the divine will first rudiments are to be handed on.

¶ “Having the form,” that is, the formation, “of knowledge and truth in the law.” That is, having the manner of forming others according to knowledge of the law and according to the true sense of the law. And this action of formation directly corresponds to the fifth prerogative, by

TO THE ROMANS

which the Jew is instructed in the sense of the law by living voice from teachers.

¶ “Therefore you who teach another, do you not teach yourself? You who preach that one must not steal, do you steal? You who say that one must not commit adultery, do you commit adultery? You who abhor idols, do you commit sacrilege?” All these things added must be read reprovably, so that from them he infers a detestable perversity, which he first asserts in general, saying: “Therefore you who teach another, do you not teach yourself?” Then he explains it in two species of offenses against neighbor: with respect to goods indeed, by theft; but with respect to persons, by adultery. And in two against God: the first is sacrilege; the other is transgression of the law—not of just any kind, but such and so great that it turns to the dishonoring of God, saying: “You who glory in the law, through transgression of the law you dishonor God.” And properly there seems to be signified either contempt, or frequent, or notable, or scandalous transgression of the law, so that this crime is distinguished from the other crimes mentioned above. For this kind of crime is that which properly causes God to be dishonored by the Gentiles. For when Gentiles see that those who glory in God’s law despise it in deeds and despise God, they think that what is said about Him by those professing God’s law is not true. Hence for this he brings the authority of Scripture: “For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you,” that is, because of you. And this authority is taken from Isaiah chapter 52 and Ezekiel chapter 36. This today is verified according to the letter among foreign nations, who see the abundance of crimes among Christians. “As it is written.”

¶ “Circumcision indeed profits.” There are two first principles of the Jews: one is the law of Moses; the other is circumcision given to Abraham. And therefore, after he has proved up to this point that in the divine judgment deeds are weighed, from the fact that the divine judgment weighs not the law but works according to the law, both in Jews and in Gentiles, he now shows the same by declaring similarly in Gentiles and Jews as related to circumcision; so that, just as by referring

CHAPTER TWO

both to the written law he proved that there is not in the divine judgment respect of persons but of deeds, so by referring both to circumcision he proves the same: so that, as he depressed the Jews by making the Gentiles equal to them with respect to the merit of deeds of the law, so he may depress them likewise by making the Gentiles equal to them with respect to deeds of circumcision. And he tends to a higher end: namely, that the justice of circumcision is nothing but the justice of work by a similar reason, namely, from the fact that Gentiles can attain by deeds the justice of circumcision, and circumcision without deeds does not profit.

¶ “Circumcision indeed profits, if you keep the law.” Note here that the sense of the words is understood from the manner of speaking, and therefore these words of Paul, “Circumcision indeed profits,” must be weighed by the manner of speaking. But it is evident that the manner of speaking is to distinguish from the opposite: on the one hand Jews circumcised, on the other Gentiles in uncircumcision according to the natural light; for this is manifestly explained: “and he shall judge the uncircumcision which is by nature.” From this it is manifest that the present discourse is about circumcision and uncircumcision absolutely, and not about the state in which Christians then were who were converted from Jews and Gentiles. And therefore the Apostle speaks truly, speaking absolutely: circumcision profits—without doubt unto eternal salvation—if you keep the law in deeds; for circumcision was a sign of a certain profession. Hence also he wrote to the Galatians: “I testify to every man that is circumcised that he is a debtor to the whole law.” And just as we say that the profession of the pontificate or of religion profits if it is proved by deeds, so the Apostle says that circumcision commanded to Abraham profits if you keep the law.

¶ “But if you are a transgressor of the law, your circumcision has become uncircumcision.” That is, your carnal circumcision has been turned into uncircumcision; that is, it has no merit, just as uncircumcision has none. And by these things he declared that, just as the law, so circumcision profits nothing without the merits of deeds.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “If therefore uncircumcision keep the justices of the law.” Understand moral matters, as was declared before. And by the designation “uncircumcision” understand Gentiles in their natural state. “Shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?” As if he were saying: even so. That is, will not that Gentile have merit as though circumcised? Just as above he showed Gentiles to be doers of the law, so now he shows the same to have the merit of the circumcised.

¶ “And that which is by nature uncircumcision shall judge you.” That is, the Gentile according to the natural light. “Fulfilling the law.” That is, fulfilling the moral justice of the law. “You.” The accusative “you” is construed with the verb “shall judge.” For the sense is: “and that which is by nature uncircumcision, fulfilling the law, shall judge you,” without doubt comparatively, as: “the men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment and shall condemn this generation.” “Who through the letter and circumcision are a transgressor of the law.” He says “through the letter” by reason of the written law, and he says “circumcision” by reason of carnal circumcision. And the sense is: he shall condemn you who, professing the written law and professing circumcision, are a transgressor with respect to deeds of the law.

¶ “For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly.” He gives the reason for the equality of Jews and Gentiles with respect to deeds. And first he touches the profession of the Mosaic law, saying: “For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly,” that is, in public profession. The discourse is suspended without the principal verb up to the end. “Nor is circumcision that which is outwardly in the flesh,” that is, nor is the public profession of carnal circumcision.

¶ “But he is a Jew who is one inwardly,” that is, he who in deeds keeps the moral justices that are in the law of the Jews. And such a one is called by the Apostle a Jew “inwardly,” insofar as he does not profess himself a Jew, but in deeds is truly obedient to the law given by God to the Jews.

¶ “And circumcision of the heart,” not of the flesh, which namely removes superfluities from the heart. “In spirit, not in letter.” It is not

CHAPTER TWO

enough to say “circumcision of the heart,” but he added “in spirit, not in letter,” to declare that carnal circumcision is not only circumcision of the flesh, but also regards the letter, as “letter” is distinguished against “spirit.” For what it has of flesh it had from Abraham; but what it has of letter it had from Moses, who first wrote it. Whereas circumcision is called “of the heart” against the flesh, and is called “in spirit,” that is, understood in a spiritual sense, against the letter—lest you should understand circumcision prescribed in the law as held by the Gentiles in vow even if not in deed, or as having to be held by vow by all.

¶ “Whose praise is not from men but from God.” Up to this place the discourse was suspended; but here the principal verb is understood to be the verb of being, saying: “is, whose praise is not from men but from God.” Thus the sense is: not he who is a Jew outwardly, nor circumcision outwardly, but he who is a Jew inwardly and circumcision of the heart is, whose praise is not from men but from God. From this the whole reason hangs: namely, that God praises not the professor of the law or of carnal circumcision, but the one who in deed and in inward spirit is a Jew and circumcised. For divine praise, not human praise, corresponds to true merits.

¶ And by these things Paul has depressed the Gentiles in two ways—by reason of the wise and by reason of judges—and he has also depressed the Jews in two ways: both with respect to the law and with respect to circumcision without deeds, showing the Gentiles equal to them according to the merit of deeds. And he said all these things while declaring the wrath of God revealed in the Gospel upon all who suppress the truth in unrighteousness. For he declared wrath both against the wise and against judges and against all, even the Jews, rendering to each according to his works.

CHAPTER III

¶ “What advantage then has the Jew?” After he had, from that clause “for the righteousness of God is revealed in it,” declared by the contrary (namely, by the unrighteousness punished and to be punished by God) and by wondrous art had at once set forth, from deficient righteousness, namely the righteousness of work, in which in a certain way Gentiles are made equal to Jews, he now directly declares that very righteousness of God revealed in the Gospel, on the part of the righteousness of God itself. He introduces this, however, by raising questions concerning the previously stated equality of Gentiles and Jews with respect to the righteousness of work. And he raises two questions. The first pertains to the time of the Law, saying: “What advantage then has the Jew?” For it has already been said that he uses the name Jew as a name for the people of Israel. Now the time when Israelites began to be a people is the same as the time of the Law. Therefore the first question is: if the Gentile without the Law attains the righteousness of works of the Law, what more does the Jewish people have from the Law? The second question pertains to circumcision, saying: “Or what is the usefulness of circumcision?” And it is similar to the first. If the Gentile without circumcision attains the righteousness and merit of works which the circumcised attains, to what is circumcision useful?

¶ “Much, in every way.” Paul answers both questions, first summarily and in general, saying two things: that it is “much,” and that it is “in every way,” that is, that the Jew has much more advantage, the circumcised has much usefulness above the Gentile, and this not only in one way but in every way. But what this “much” is, and what those “all ways” are, he will declare later by recounting the prerogatives of the Jews (which extend to the end of the Epistle).

¶ “First indeed.” He begins to declare in particular the “much” and the “way.” And the adverb “first” signifies an order of enumeration, for he

CHAPTER THREE

will add many other prerogatives of the Jews. “For to them were entrusted”—this remains to them—“the oracles of God.” Behold a great prerogative by which the Jew surpasses the Gentile: because the oracles of God were entrusted, that is, committed, not to the Gentile but to the Jewish people; for the Mosaic law and the prophecies were given by God to the Jewish people and not to the Gentile.

¶ “For what if some of them did not believe?” Against this prerogative of the Jewish people it can be objected that, although God entrusted His oracles to that people, revealing to it what He was going to do, nevertheless they rendered themselves unworthy of this prerogative, because many of the Jews did not believe the divine oracles, as is plainly evident in the books of Sacred Scripture. The Apostle excludes this objection, not by defending their worthiness, but by defending the perseverance of divine truthfulness notwithstanding the unworthiness of the unbelieving. And therefore he adds: “Has their unbelief made void the faith,” that is, the fidelity, the truthfulness—for here “faith” is taken for faithfulness whereby things are said—“of God?” “Has it made it void,” that is, will it take away, abolish? “Far be it.” It is an assertion with horror: for it would be dreadful if the unbelief of men should take away divine fidelity, should take away from God His making the things He has said.

¶ “Let it be,” or “let it become”: “But let God be true, and every man a liar.” Note that it is in the imperative mood: “let it be.” And just as he said with horror “far be it,” intending to assert, so now he also, intending to assert in a deprecatory mode, subjoins that God “be” or “become” true, however much every man “be” or “become” a liar. Yet it can be read imperatively, so that a command is signified to interpreters of Sacred Scripture: that God be true, and every man a liar; that is, that in interpreting the divine oracles they always understand God to be truthful, however much it might be necessary to understand every man to be a liar.

¶ “As it is written,” in Psalm 51: “That you may be justified in your words.” Note that Paul adduces the authority of the psalm according to

TO THE ROMANS

the Greek interpretation. Yet the sense returns to the same. For to be justified in words is nothing other than to be shown just in what is said, which is to do what is said, which is to be truthful. And in the literal sense the psalm speaks of every justification in word, which is nothing other than to do what is said. But how this sentence is construed with the rest of the psalm, we have written there.

¶ “And may prevail when you are judged.” In Hebrew this sentence is had word for word. Therefore it reads: “You shall be justified in your speaking; you shall be cleansed in your judging.” In the Greek, however, in this passage it reads: “and may prevail when you are judged,” passively. And the sense is that, while you are truthful by doing what you say, you will prevail over the judgments of others who think that you will not do what you have said. And it was directly to the Apostle’s purpose, tending to this: that the demerits and unbelief of men are overcome by divine truthfulness. Thus, however much, according to human judgments, the promises ought not to be kept because of the demerits of men, divine truthfulness nevertheless overcomes all things.

¶ Note here that this doctrine is true and must be understood in those things that are said by God absolutely, not in those things that are said by reason of human merits. Hence in Jeremiah chapter 18 God says: “Suddenly I will speak against a nation and against a kingdom, that I will uproot and destroy and scatter; if that nation shall do repentance, I also will repent of the evil that I spoke,” and so forth. Hence theologians say that these things are said according to threatening, but those according to predestination. In the former, understand that the unbelief and demerits of men do not make void the faithfulness of God, because in the former the faithfulness of God alone has place, since God says those things from Himself alone. For what He says by threatening or promising according to changeable merits He does not say according to Himself but according to those merits; and therefore, when those merits are changed, the truthfulness of God is not changed. Therefore, speaking simply and absolutely, it is most true that the demerit and unbelief of men do not take away the truthfulness of God, although they sometimes take away

CHAPTER THREE

the fulfillments that were going to occur according to their merits: as the repentance of the Ninevites removed the overthrow of Nineveh, and likewise in similar cases.

¶ “But if our unrighteousness commends the righteousness of God.” Note that this text can be introduced in two ways. Either as a question arising from the foregoing, and then the question is not solved in the letter but is left unsolved, as is clear to one inspecting the text. Or as an exclusion of a false sense that could be perceived from the words of the psalm adduced; and in this way everything fits. And therefore, when expounding the text in this way, know that upon the conjunction “that” (since it was said “that you may be justified”) and much more, according to the Hebrew, upon the conjunction “therefore,” a false sense could be founded. For that conjunction “that,” or “therefore,” is joined to the committed sin. For when he had said, “Against you alone have I sinned, and have done evil before you,” he added “that you may be justified,” or “therefore you shall be justified.” Hence it could be understood that our sin were directly for the commendation of divine justice, on account of that conjunction “that” or “therefore.” The Apostle intends to exclude this sense as false. And therefore he proposes this sense with an adversative conjunction, saying: “But if our unrighteousness commends the righteousness of God.” As if this sense were saying: “What shall we say?” Behold the inconvenience, because it follows that we lack a response: “What shall we say?” as if he said: we have nothing to say.

¶ “Is God unjust who inflicts wrath?” He manifests why we have nothing to say: because, if we followed the consequence, we would have to say that God is unjust, as one who inflicts vengeance for sins that commend God’s own justice. For no prince justly punishes things that are done to the praise of that prince; and thus God would not justly punish our unrighteousness if our unrighteousness commends the righteousness of God. This inconvenience he subjoins interrogatively, as manifestly false and to be avoided.

¶ “I speak according to man,” that is, I speak according to human disputation. For I know that it is not to be turned into the question

TO THE ROMANS

whether God is just. “Far be it.” It is also a thing to be horrified at even to hear that God is unjust.

¶ “Otherwise, how shall God judge this world?” “This” remains. And satisfying human disputation, he brings a reason from the office of judging the world, by which in God no injustice is found. For the judge not only of this man or that, but of the world, must be just, since He is the supreme judge, that is, the one saying what is right. For the first one saying what is right must by his very nature be lifted above all injustice, just as the first alterer must be unalterable, and the first mover must be immovable.

¶ “But if the truth of God has abounded in my lie unto His glory.” Just as he deduced the inconvenience (namely, that God would have to be called unjust) from that false sense in the matter of our unrighteousness and God’s righteousness, so now he deduces inconveniences following from the same false sense applied to the matter of our lie and divine truth. And he distinctly deduces it in the matter of unrighteousness and righteousness, and in the matter of lying and truth, because each matter had been introduced. The matter indeed of our unrighteousness and God’s righteousness was in the authority brought from the psalm; but the matter of lying and truth was in Paul’s own words: “Let God be true, and every man a liar.” He therefore excludes the same false sense in the matter of our lie related to divine truthfulness, taking that false sense as the antecedent of a conditional whose consequent is an inconvenience to which he reduces it.

¶ For the conditional is this: “If in my lie the divine truth has abounded unto glory,” that is, has increased in glory, has been made more glorious—this whole is the antecedent. And the first consequent is added: “Why then am I also still judged as a sinner?” That is, I ought not to be judged as a sinner, since I am a liar, but as a promoter of the glory of divine truth. Which is manifestly an inconvenience and false; therefore the antecedent from which it follows is false.

¶ “And not—as we are blasphemed and as some say that we say—let us do evils that goods may come?” Another inconvenience following

CHAPTER THREE

from the same antecedent and sense is added, universal: namely, that it is lawful to do evils that goods may come. And he adds this not simply but as something imposed upon apostolic doctrine. For when the apostles preached that where offenses abound the grace of God superabounds, and the like, there were not lacking men of perverse sense who imposed upon the apostles that they taught that evils must be done so that goods might come. Because of such men to be refuted Paul here makes, as it were, a digression in treating these matters.

¶ But it is evident that this is false and horrible and follows from that false sense, namely, that our unrighteousness and our lie commend the righteousness and promote the glory of divine truth. For from this sense it follows that these things are lawful for the glory of God; and likewise other evils are lawful so that goods may come. Understand, novice, that according to sound and true doctrine sins are not to be chosen as means to any good end, because by their very nature it is repugnant to sin that it be something eligible. And therefore neither for itself nor for any other good is it eligible. And therefore the Apostle condemns this sense which perverse men had taken up, namely, that our unrighteousness is a means of commending the righteousness of God, and likewise that our lie is a means of increasing the glory of divine truth; and universally, that the evils of fault are means to be done so that goods may come.

¶ Yet with this sound doctrine, understand also that it is most true that sins are the matter of divine justice, that our lie is the matter of divine glory—just as the crimes of thieves and parricides are the matter of the justice of the human judge and are occasions of the glory of his justice. And they are sometimes also the matter of a prince's mercy, as is evident. Therefore when the Prophet said “that you may be justified” and the like, it is not signified that sin is offered as a fitting means to the end; rather, it is signified that sin is the matter in which truthfulness and the like shine forth all the more. Thus, one who commits parricide and asks pardon from a prince, so that in so great a crime the sublimity of his power might shine forth, freed from law.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ And you too, learned reader, note that because the avoidance of a worse evil is a certain good, and is of the same account as good with respect to just and unjust, honorable and dishonorable (as the philosophers also judged), therefore by the same doctrine by which we shudder to do evils so that goods may come, by that same we must shudder to do evils so that we may avoid worse things. For to avoid worse things is a certain good, and much less good than to attain good. And therefore, if for a good it is not to be done that evil be done, it necessarily follows that neither is it to be done for avoiding a greater evil. Hence Paul adds: “Whose condemnation is just.” And the relative “whose” refers to those who do evils so that goods may come.

¶ Nor should you think that Gregory, or the Council of Toledo in Distinction 13 of the *Decretum*, held the contrary. Rather, Gregory speaks conditionally (with the condition depending not on the part of things, but on the part of the man), saying: “If absolutely no way is open without sin.” For perplexity is not given on the part of things; but it can happen on the part of a man who does not know how to escape, does not see a way of escape without some sin. And in that case he counsels, by way of indulgence, to choose the lesser evil, using the authority of the Apostle concerning a wife, for avoiding fornication. But the Council of Toledo does not teach to choose the lesser sin, but the loosening of a lesser bond or tie, which is evidently done without sin, as is clear in the example of the loosening of an oath or of an evil promise. Therefore in no way is evil to be done so that any good may come, even the good of avoiding a worse evil, speaking absolutely according to apostolic doctrine.

¶ “What then?” After the response given to the first question concerning the prerogatives of the Jews, he raises another question arising from the given response in which it was said that there is “much in every way” conferred upon the Jew beyond the Gentile. For from this another question arises: “What then?” that is, what is inferred from this response? “Do we excel them?” This remains. And he explains what it is: whether we Jews excel. Therefore the sense of the question is: does it follow from what has been said that we Jews excel others without qualification? And

CHAPTER THREE

the discourse is about excellence by which one man surpasses another not according to some prerogative, but simply and absolutely.

¶ “By no means.” Behold the response to this question. “For we have previously charged Jews and Greeks all to be under sin.” That is, because we have previously brought forward the cause of this negation, and it is that both Jews and Greeks are all under sin. Hence it appears first that by the designation of Hellenes (which is a name for Greeks) Paul intends Gentiles—either because the word is extended to signify Gentiles, as Jerome judges, or because Greeks, over against Jews, are of the same account with the rest of the Gentiles. It appears secondly that Paul speaks of actual sin, saying that all are under sin, because he speaks of that sin which he had previously said to be in Jews and Gentiles, himself saying, “for we have previously charged,” and so forth. But it is evident that up to this point he has spoken only of actual sins. He therefore intends from this, that it is common to Jews and Gentiles to be under sin, that Jews do not surpass Gentiles simply and absolutely, although they surpass them according to certain prerogatives. But more significantly he says “to be under sin,” and he does not say “to be sinners” or “to have sinned.” For he intends to signify, and he signifies, that it is common to Jews and Gentiles to remain under the sin committed by themselves, as he will make clearer.

¶ “As it is written,” not in one but in many places of Sacred Scripture. For Paul has taken what follows from diverse books of Scripture; but some ignorant person added these words to Psalm 14, as we have explained more fully there.

¶ “That there is none righteous,” “no, not one.” This is taken from Ecclesiastes chapter 7. And the sense is (as is there added) that there is no man who does not sin.

¶ “There is none who understands.” This, with some of what follows, is taken from Psalm 14, where it is said: “that He may see if there is one who understands or seeks God; all have declined,” and so forth. And just as all-righteousness is denied in the will, so all-prudence is denied. “There is none who seeks God,” totally. “All have turned aside,”

TO THE ROMANS

from the straight path. “They have together become unprofitable,” for attaining the eternal end. “There is none who does good,” supply: without sin. “There is none even to one,” inclusively. For no mere man is excepted.

¶ “Their throat is an open sepulchre.” This is taken from Psalm 5. And up to this point he has recalled denials and departures from what is right and good; but now, proceeding to evil, he recalls evils committed in speech, beginning from foul speech, comparing their throat to an open sepulchre, and by this to a foul stench. “With their tongues they dealt deceitfully.” Any lying speech is described as a deceitful tongue.

¶ “The poison of asps is under their lips.” This is taken from Psalm 140. And harmful speech is signified by the likeness of poison at the highest extreme, namely that of asps, which is said to be incurable.

¶ “Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness.” This is taken from Psalm 10, where it is said: “whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness.” And the mouth is called full of cursing by way of imprecation and detestation, and likewise full of bitterness toward others, while they both wish evils upon others and execrate the deeds of others; and what is worse, they pour bitterness into others by their tongue, not here or there but everywhere. For what is full of bitterness pours forth everywhere.

¶ “Their feet are swift to shed blood.” This, with some following, is taken from Isaiah chapter 59. After sins of omission and of the mouth, he adds sins of deed, beginning from the worst deed against neighbor, namely homicide—and not simple, but with swiftness of feet, with haste to the shedding of human blood. “Destruction,” of other men; “and unhappiness,” of other men, “in their ways,” that is, in various pursuits and works. They study for this, that they may oppress, indeed crush, others and bring them to misery. “And they have not known the way of peace,” by practical and affective knowledge; rather, they devote themselves only to seditions or wars. Therefore they take away life, goods, honors, and peace.

¶ “There is no fear of God before their eyes.” This is taken from Psalm 36. And in this one statement all sins of thought or of the heart are

CHAPTER THREE

comprehended, as in that in which the bridle of all internal movements consists. For only fear of the divine gaze draws back from inward disorder of soul, since men are hidden from all.

¶ “But we know that whatever the Law says, it speaks to those who are in the Law.” He applies what was brought from Scripture to the Jews. By the designation “Law” understand the whole Scripture of the Old Testament. And the discourse concerns those things that are said indeterminately in Scripture, as distinguished from those things that are said specifically about some nation, as in Isaiah: “the burden of Tyre,” “the burden of Babylon,” and the like.

¶ “That every mouth may be stopped.” He declares for what these things were written from the fruit. For therefore it is declared that all are under sin, that every mouth may be stopped, both of Jews and of Gentiles presuming on their own righteousness. “And that the whole world may be made subject to God.” Although the whole world, willing or unwilling, is subject to God, these things nevertheless are written so that willingly, laudably, the whole world may subject itself to God for gratuitous justification; or, as others interpret, that the whole world may render itself liable to God for justification.

¶ “Because from the works of the law no flesh shall be justified before Him.” Between the righteousness of work and the righteousness of God this is the difference: that the righteousness of work justifies only that work of which it is the righteousness, and it justifies the doer according to the habit of that work; but the righteousness of God justifies man absolutely. And this is to say that the righteousness of work does not justify man absolutely, because it does not blot out sins, but leaves man in the sins he has committed. But the righteousness of God justifies man absolutely, because it blots out the sins it finds in man. And according to this distinction (which the Apostle will add more clearly) what is now said and what was said in the preceding chapter is verified. For when it was said that the doers of the law shall be justified with God, understand this of the justification of men according to works; but when it is now said that from the works of the law no flesh shall be justified before Him,

TO THE ROMANS

understand this of the justification of man absolutely. And he says “all flesh” to include every nation, whether Jewish or Gentile, which above he had said to be justified according to deeds.

¶ “For through the law is the knowledge of sin.” He proves that the law does not justify because through the law knowledge of sin is had. And knowledge is taken as opposed to remission, so that the sense is: through the law knowledge is had, but not remission, of sin. But justification absolutely must be with remission of sin.

¶ “But now,” that is, in the time of the Messiah, “without the law,” that is, without the yoke of the Mosaic law, “the righteousness of God,” distinguished from the righteousness of work (of which it was said at the beginning: “for the righteousness of God is revealed in it”), “has been manifested.” On the day of Pentecost and thereafter the righteousness of God was manifested without the yoke of the old law, the righteousness of God justifying man absolutely. And more significantly he says “has been manifested,” and he does not say “has been created” or “has been made,” because the righteousness of God was from the beginning justifying all the saints and was not newly made; but it has been newly manifested. For there was the righteousness of faith in the Fathers, and there was also in some Gentiles, as is clear in Job. But it was as though hidden, both as to the thing believed—namely, Jesus Christ—and as to promulgation, because it had not been promulgated to the world.

¶ “Testified by the Law and the Prophets.” Lest the righteousness of God be thought of as a new thing, or as something introduced, he added that it is testified by the law of Moses and the prophets, so that from the testimony of the Law and the Prophets he may declare that men are not justified simply and absolutely by the works of the law (that is, not by the righteousness of any works whatever, moral, ceremonial, and judicial), but by the righteousness of God.

¶ “But the righteousness of God through faith of Jesus Christ.” He had said “the righteousness of God,” and he had said “from faith to faith,” but he had not explained the matter of faith, he had not explained the manner by which the righteousness of God is joined to us. And therefore

CHAPTER THREE

he now explains both, saying: “But the righteousness of God through faith.” Behold the manner by which the righteousness of God is applied to us. “Of Jesus Christ.” Behold the matter of faith. “To all and upon all who believe in Him.” “In Him” remains and indeed is superfluous, because it is “to all and upon all who believe,” so that we may understand that the righteousness of God through faith of Jesus Christ has been, is, and will be to all and upon all who believe; and that no one is saved in his own faith, but that one is justified only through faith of Jesus Christ. For this righteousness of God has always been such; but now it has been manifested, testified by the Law and the Prophets.

¶ He says “to all and upon all” to signify extension toward all, and with this superiority. For the righteousness of God through faith of Jesus Christ surpasses the justices of works.

¶ “For there is no distinction.” He proves what he had said, “to all and upon all,” because there is no distinction in this. “For all have sinned.” From this you can see that the aforesaid difference is of the Apostle’s intention. For from the fact that it is common to all (both Jews and Gentiles) to have sinned, the Apostle proves that the righteousness of God through faith of Jesus Christ is “to all and upon all,” openly signifying that neither by the justices of works did Jews or Gentiles come to be justified by a righteousness remitting sins, but by the righteousness of God through faith of Jesus Christ alone— as he will clearly add. “And they lack the glory of God.” Either by “the glory of God” you may understand the glory of the heavenly fatherland, or more literally glory before God. For he who has sinned, until sin is remitted to him, is not praised; he is not glorious before God. And he said this directly to distinguish it from glory which one has before men, even when one who once sinned exercises justices of works. For such a one lacks the glory of God from the fact that he has not obtained forgiveness of sin, although he has the glory of men. And that this is the literal sense can be evident in the following chapter, where it will be said of Abraham that from works he indeed has glory, but not before God.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “Being justified freely by His grace.” The word translated “being justified” is a passive participle of the present tense, which the Latin tongue lacks; and therefore some translators render it “are justified.” And he says that all have sinned and lack glory before God; yet they “are justified,” that is, from sinners they are just, “freely,” that is, not by works but gratuitously. And lest you ask whose this gratuitous benefit is, he explains: “by His grace,” namely of God. Here it is clearly explained that the righteousness of God justifying the sinner is had not from works but by the grace of God.

¶ “Through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.” He declares the reason for the righteousness of God through the intervening redemption of men made through Jesus Christ. Here note that in this, that men from sinners are made just, both the grace of God and the righteousness of God concur. Thus not grace alone concurs— which would then alone concur if God remitted sins without any payment. But God never did this nor does He do it; rather, He inserts His righteousness into His grace, which the Apostle so often names the righteousness of God. And now he explains that this righteousness consists in redemption, that is, in the payment of the price which Jesus made to absolve us from the captivity or slavery of sin.

¶ But if against this it is objected that these two conflict with one another—namely, that we are justified freely by the grace of God, and that we are justified through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus—for if through redemption, then not freely; and if through grace, then not through the justice of redemption—the solution is that Sacred Scripture does not say that we are justified by grace alone, but by grace together with justice, and both are God’s; that is, by the grace of God and the righteousness of God, and not by the righteousness of men. And therefore the Apostle so often repeats “the righteousness of God.” Thus the grace of God does not exclude the righteousness of God, but the righteousness of men. But the redemption made through Christ is the righteousness of God, not our righteousness, because Jesus Christ truly is God. And significantly he does not say “which was made by Christ Jesus,”

CHAPTER THREE

but “which is in Christ Jesus,” so that we might understand redemption not as made by things or money, but as existing in His own flesh and blood and soul.

¶ “Whom God set forth as a propitiator.” The Greek word is ambiguous as to “propitiation” in the masculine or neuter gender, because it is accusative; but the masculine seems more fitting for the intended sense, so that the meaning is: “whom God set forth as a placater.” And he placed this to signify that the redemption of Jesus Christ does not diminish but rather increases the grace of God toward us, so that we may understand that from divine grace there is given to us not only pardon, but also there is given to us a placater. And therefore, on God’s part, he introduces such a Redeemer, saying: “whom God set forth as a propitiator or placater,” without doubt by redeeming.

¶ “Through faith in His blood.” He gradually explains the mysteries. For at the beginning he had said “from faith to faith”; afterward he explained “through faith of Jesus Christ.” Now, articulating more clearly, he expounds the faith of the death of Jesus Christ, saying: “through faith in His blood.” For faith in the blood of Jesus is the faith that rests upon the death which came through the shedding of the blood of Jesus. And note three things the Apostle has brought forward in this sentence: first, saying “by His grace”; second, “through redemption”; and third, “through faith in His blood,” so that we may understand that for justifying us there concurs first on God’s part grace, then on the part of Jesus Christ the righteousness of redemption, and finally on our part faith in the blood of Jesus Christ. And grace indeed holds the first place, as being also the cause of the second and the third. The second is of grace, yet it constitutes the character of the righteousness of God. The third (namely faith) is the application and conjunction of both to us.

¶ “For the showing of His righteousness.” These words are joined with the preceding, namely “in His blood,” and they are added to give the reason why “in His blood,” why God set Jesus as placater in the blood of Jesus. And the reason is explained: namely, “for the showing of His righteousness,” that is, of God. For to demonstrate divine righteousness

TO THE ROMANS

God determined that Jesus should placate God in His own blood, as though paying the price of human redemption.

¶ “Because of the remission of former offenses.” Here the reason for His righteousness is subjoined. And the remission of former offenses is this: that in order that the former offenses might be remitted, divine righteousness required such a redemption as was said above; otherwise remission of offenses would not be a fruit of divine righteousness. Here you can most clearly see what we said above concerning the Apostle’s intention: that in this the righteousness of God differs from the righteousness of works, that the righteousness of works is not remissive of former offenses, but the righteousness of God is remissive of former offenses. And significantly he added “former,” so that we may understand also the sins of men in the past before the coming of Christ. For the clearer declaration of this he adds: “In the forbearance,” that is, the tolerance, “of God, for the showing of His righteousness at this time.”

¶ He had said “for the showing of His righteousness because of the remission of former offenses.” Now he adds the reason why so great a span of time intervened between the former offenses and the showing of divine righteousness. And he explains that the reason is divine forbearance, by which He tolerated former offenses in order that at this time determined by Him He might show divine righteousness. And lest you ask for what this tolerant delay of righteousness was, he adds the reason: “That He Himself may be just and the justifier of him who is from the faith of Jesus”—“Christ” is superfluous. That is, for two things to be fulfilled together. One is that in execution God Himself may be just, and not only merciful or conferring grace. And this is directly the reason for the showing of divine righteousness. The other is that He may be the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus. And this directly regards the determination of righteousness for this time, namely the death of Jesus: so that man might be justified by God not in just any way, but by reason of faith in the blood of Jesus. For it was necessary to await the very death of Jesus, in which redemption and propitiation were put into execution. And it was necessary also to await faith, because it is

CHAPTER THREE

necessary that all who are justified “be,” that is, stand and consist in mind and disposition, from the faith of Jesus.

¶ “Where then is boasting?” Two words are superfluous, namely “is” and “your.” Thus it must be read: “Where then is boasting?” He infers indefinitely, arguing: where then is boasting? And the discourse is about the glory of righteousness. He infers it from the foregoing: namely, that for the remission of former sins God set forth Jesus as placater, resting upon His blood. For from this every boasting of human righteousness is excluded. And although this discourse can be common to Jew and Gentile, it is directed directly to the Jew, concerning whom he had raised the question whether he excelled, and who gloried in the righteousness of the law received from God through Moses.

¶ “It is excluded”—namely, boasting. “By what law?” It must be read interrogatively. “Of works?” It must be read interrogatively. He calls the law of Moses a “law of works,” both with respect to moral, ceremonial, and judicial precepts, because it was a law of works, as every other written law is. And in this the natural law is also included, which likewise is a law of works. “No.” Behold the response as to the negative part. “But by the law of faith.” And this is the response as to the affirmative part. He calls “the law of faith” the whole structure of the foregoing things said that concur for the righteousness of God justifying men.

¶ If you ask in what way the law of faith is distinguished by Paul against the law of works even moral works, since faith too is contained under the genus of works—for to believe is our work—the solution is that to believe in Him who justifies the ungodly rests upon another’s righteousness, namely God’s through Christ; but the other works rest upon one’s own righteousness, namely that each work is good according to itself and makes its possessor good. And therefore the righteousness of faith is distinguished against the righteousness of works.

¶ “We judge therefore that a man is justified by faith without works of the law.” He explains more clearly the conclusion intended from the premises, saying: “We judge therefore that a man is justified by faith

TO THE ROMANS

without works of the law” that justify. For he does not intend to exclude the works of the law of which he said above that the doers of the law shall be justified with God. He does not intend, I say, to exclude them from execution, but from justification: that is, from the power of justifying man absolutely, which is to say from the power of remitting sins. For the discourse concerns justification of this sort.

¶ “Is He the God of Jews only?” This reason is brought directly against the ceremonial and judicial precepts of the law of Moses, because these were proper to the Jews; for the moral precepts were common to them and to the nations. And he intends that if, for justifying man, works of the law’s judicial and ceremonial precepts were required—in which, as in their own prerogatives, the Jews gloried—it would follow that God would be the God of Jews only, namely as justifier. And therefore, to exclude this, he says: “Is He the God of Jews only?” Just as we now truly say that God is of believers only, because He justifies only believers.

¶ “Is He not also of the Gentiles? Yes, also of the Gentiles.” And he adds the reason: “Since God is one.” From the fact that it is one and the same God who justifies by faith both Jews and Gentiles, he makes manifest that God is both of Jews and of Gentiles; that is, Gentiles need not become Jews, they need not undergo the yoke of the Mosaic law in order to be justified.

¶ “Who justifies,” that is, “will justify.” It is of the future tense to signify perseverance: that is, that He will not only now, not only past or present, but always will persevere in this, that He will justify by faith. And he said this in the future, having already spoken of the past, “because of the remission of former offenses.” “The circumcision from faith,” that is, the circumcised not from circumcision itself but from the faith explained above. “And the uncircumcision,” that is, Gentiles persevering uncircumcised, “through faith,” the same faith, and not through the moral justices of works.

¶ “Do we then destroy the law through faith?” It must be read interrogatively. For he raises against what has been said a question, as though it follows from these things that faith destroys the law of Moses.

CHAPTER THREE

“Far be it.” The response is one of horror. “But we establish the law,” that is, we strengthen it. Note here that, since faith in Jesus Christ has always been explicitly or implicitly in all who have obtained remission of sins from the beginning of the world, from the fact that the power of faith to justify is commended and declared, the law of Moses is not destroyed nor abolished (otherwise the law of Moses would have had no place among the faithful), but it is declared that neither in the law nor in the works of the law is there a power that remits sins. And therefore Paul most rightly shudders, saying, “Far be it.”

¶ But what he adds, “but we establish the law” (that is, we strengthen it), is not to be understood as though by this doctrine the law of Moses received some strength; but that what faith commends redounds to the support of the law. And indeed it is so: for unless faith supported the law, it would totter and waver in the minds of men as a human invention, as is evident from the fact that among unbelievers the law of Moses is held in this way.

CHAPTER IV

¶ What then shall we say that Abraham our father has found according to the flesh? At the beginning of chapter three he had raised two questions: one about the Jew, the other about circumcision. Having resolved the first question, he now intends to treat the second, namely, what usefulness circumcision has. Hence he also resumes it in Abraham, the father of circumcision, under other words, saying, “What then shall we say that Abraham our father has found according to the flesh,” that is, according to carnal circumcision. Thus “according to the flesh” is referred to the verb “has found.” And this question arises from what has been said: namely, that the justice of God is in all and upon all, not from works but from faith in Jesus Christ. For from this the question springs: what then did Abraham find according to circumcision in the flesh, if he did not find the justice of God? For if Abraham was justified by the works of the Law...

¶ He answers the question, first negatively with respect to justification, that is, that he was not justified through circumcision. And to make this clear he assumes a conditional whose antecedent is, “Abraham was justified by works,” and whose consequent is, “He has glory,” that is, boasting, but not before God. For because carnal circumcision is among works, therefore, including also circumcision and the other moral works, he assumes that if Abraham was justified from works, whether moral or ceremonial, he indeed has boasting (because from just works he has something of which to boast), but not before God, because his offenses would still remain. For however much (as was said earlier) a man exercises himself in good moral and ceremonial works, he never thereby attains the remission of sins; rather he is justified only in works and in himself according to the habits of works. And for that reason he has merits of virtues from which to boast, but not before God, before whom he would still remain without glory by reason of sins.

CHAPTER FOUR

¶ For what does the Scripture say? Having proposed the conditional, he proceeds to the destruction of the consequent by the authority of Scripture. The consequent had been: “he does not have boasting before God.” This he intends to destroy by showing from the authority of Scripture the truth of its contrary, namely, that Abraham had justice before God. Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him for justice. This sentence is taken from the Book of Genesis, chapter fifteen. In it it is clear that Abraham’s faith was reckoned to him for justice before God, so that justice before God was not imputed to Abraham from works but from faith.

¶ Now to him who works... From the introduced text he explains the intended difference between justice from works and justice from faith. He explains this in two ways: first by weighing the words of Scripture, namely, “he believed” and “it was imputed”; then he confirms it by the authority of David. And he uses a reasoning of this sort: to one who works, the reward is given not freely but as a debt; but to one who does not work but believes, his faith is imputed freely for justice; therefore Abraham was justified not from works but from faith.

¶ Accordingly, the parts are as follows. Now to him who works, that is, who merits through works, whether moral or ceremonial, and so forth: the reward is not imputed according to grace, but according to debt. This universal proposition is most clear. But to him who does not work: he does not say “to him who works contraries,” but he only denies merits of works; that is, even if he does not work, even with no merits of works concurring. But believes in Him who justifies the ungodly, by remitting sins. It is reckoned, that is, it is imputed. The interpreter has changed the words, sometimes “imputed,” sometimes “reckoned,” although Paul uses the same word. It more properly signifies “to be imputed” than “to be reckoned,” for it signifies to be ascribed, to be attributed. His faith for justice. In this very fact that faith is imputed for justice, it is signified that justice is conferred not as a debt, not as a merit—whose opposite was said of the one who works. Thus between the one who believes and the one who works Paul draws the difference: that the

TO THE ROMANS

one who believes does not merit, that justice is not owed to the one who believes, from this very fact that Scripture says that his faith is imputed for justice. But the one who works, insofar as he is a worker, obtains as a debt the reward of his own justification, not, however, as remitting sin, as has often been said.

¶ According to the purpose of the grace of God. These four words are superfluous: perhaps added by someone to explain what it means that faith is imputed for justice. For indeed it signifies a gratuitous bestowal of justice.

¶ Just as David also says... He confirms the same by the authority of David: first explaining the sentence that is had from David's words for the purpose, by adding, the blessedness of the man, supply, "to be," to whom God counts acceptable, that is, imputes. For it is the same word as in Paul. Justice without works. These are the Apostle's words, spoken from David as to the sense; but David's own words are added: Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven. And it is a discourse about blessedness in hope. Iniquities are said to be forgiven with respect to the offense according to which an injury was inflicted on God. And whose sins are covered, with respect to the disgrace of the acts, namely, lest their disgrace further redound upon those who sinned; that is, lest they be any longer disgraceful. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin, with respect to the liability to eternal punishment.

¶ From all these, and especially from that last point (namely, the non-imputation of sin), the Apostle took David to say that God imputes justice without works, so that He makes that man blessed. For David makes mention of no work of ours, but only of the divine work that forgives, covers, and does not impute.

¶ Is this blessedness then... He applies David's authority to the proposed matter concerning Abraham's justice. Does it remain in circumcision only... Two words are superfluous, namely "only" and "does it remain." Or also in uncircumcision? From David's authority he argues to the proposed matter, asking whether this blessedness promulgated by David has place only in the circumcised or also in the uncircumcised.

CHAPTER FOUR

And immediately he proves that it has place in the uncircumcised, from the time when Abraham's faith was reckoned to him for justice: because at that time this happened when Abraham was not circumcised, but was still in uncircumcision. And the progress of the letter is clear: first repeating what was said, namely, For we say that—that is, "that"—faith was reckoned to Abraham for justice; and then saying, How then was it reckoned? He inquires into Abraham's state: In circumcision, that is, in the state of circumcision; or in uncircumcision, that is, in the state of uncircumcision? And he adds the clearest answer: Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision, as is evident from the Book of Genesis, chapter fifteen.

¶ And he received the sign of circumcision. After he answered negatively, with respect to justification, the question raised—what Abraham found in carnal circumcision—he now answers affirmatively: that is, he declares what Abraham obtained through circumcision, and declares what usefulness circumcision has. For it was necessary not only to say what it does not confer, but also what it does confer. And he explains that the usefulness of circumcision is the usefulness of a sign. And the Apostle took this from the Book of Genesis, chapter seventeen, where God says clearly to Abraham concerning circumcision: And it shall be the sign of the covenant between Me and you. Thus Abraham received the sign of carnal circumcision, that is, circumcision as a sign.

¶ A seal of the justice of faith which is in uncircumcision. It is superfluous. Through the fact that he received circumcision as a sign of the covenant between God and the others, he received it as a seal, that is, as a kind of character or impressed mark, not of any thing whatever, but of the justice had from faith in uncircumcision. Thus he calls circumcision not only a distinguishing sign of the people adopted by God, but also, specifically, as it were a character of the justice imputed to Abraham in uncircumcision because he believed God. These, therefore, are the two utilities of circumcision; these are what Abraham obtained in carnal circumcision.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ That he might be the father of all who believe through uncircumcision. From the thing signified by the seal of circumcision (namely, the justice of faith imputed to Abraham in uncircumcision) the Apostle deduces Abraham's true fatherhood, both with respect to the uncircumcised and with respect to the circumcised. And first with respect to the uncircumcised, saying, "that he might be the father of all who believe through uncircumcision," so that all uncircumcised believers may be generated from him according to faith, as imitating Abraham's faith while he was still uncircumcised. And this fatherhood is useful to them as Abraham's faith was useful to Abraham, namely, that it may be reckoned to them also for justice—their believing—just as it was reckoned to Abraham their father.

¶ And the father of circumcision. From the same thing signified he is also truly the father, not carnally but spiritually, of circumcision, that is, of the circumcised. Not to those only who are of circumcision. The text is corrupt. It must be read: "to those who are not only of circumcision." For those who rejoice in Abraham's carnal circumcision according to the Law are those who are only of circumcision; that is, those who consist only in this, that they are circumcised. The Apostle does not include these among the sons of Abraham; indeed, in distinction from such he says, "to those who are not only of circumcision," adding: but also to those who follow the footsteps of the faith which is in uncircumcision of our father Abraham. The word "is" is superfluous. Behold those for whom Abraham is father in circumcision: for it is not enough for such sonship that they be circumcised, but it is necessary that they imitate the faith which Abraham had in uncircumcision.

¶ This true fatherhood of Abraham with respect to both is deduced from the thing of which circumcision is the seal, namely, the justice of Abraham's faith in uncircumcision. And he said this to exclude the propriety which the Jews were usurping for themselves of Abraham's fatherhood with respect to circumcision; that is, that Abraham is the proper father of the circumcised. For from this fact that circumcision is not sufficient for someone to be Abraham's son, but imitation of

CHAPTER FOUR

Abraham's faith is required, it is clear that Abraham's fatherhood is not carnal, is not legal according to circumcision, but is spiritual, consisting formally in the generation of sons in the same faith—a generation common to the circumcised and the uncircumcised.

¶ For the promise that he should be heir of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed through the Law. The conjunction “for” testifies that this clause is introduced to prove what was said: namely, that Abraham, by reason of the justice of faith, is the common father of believers, both circumcised and uncircumcised. And whereas earlier he proved this from the justice imputed to Abraham at the time when he was in uncircumcision, now he proves it from the promise made to Abraham when he was already circumcised, so as to constrain the Jews more tightly to the same conclusion. For the promise of inheriting the world is read to have been made to Abraham in the Book of Genesis, chapter twenty-two, in those words: “In you shall all nations be blessed.” For in Abraham's seed (namely, the Messiah) all nations were blessed, since the Messiah, first through faith and finally through the kingdom, was established heir—not of the promised land, not of Asia, not of the whole earth, water, or air, but of the world—according to that text: “Whom He appointed heir of all things.” And the fatherhood of Abraham is proved most fittingly from the fulfillment of the promised inheritance: for in his seed there was to be an heir; and through this he is proved father in that manner in which the inheritance was to be.

¶ And when he says that the promise was not “through the Law,” the participle “made” is not understood, but the participle “to be fulfilled,” as the added reasoning clearly proves. For he offers as the reason that the promise made to Abraham about the inheritance of the world was not to be fulfilled through the Law of Moses, but through the justice of faith, common both to the circumcised and the uncircumcised, by imitation of Abraham's faith.

¶ For if they who are of the Law are heirs... Behold the reason for the negative part: namely, that the promise was not to be fulfilled through the Law. And it is a reason leading to an incongruity—indeed, to

TO THE ROMANS

the contrary of fulfilling the promise. For if those who are of the Law, that is, those subject to the Law of Moses, are constituted heirs of the world, faith is made void. Behold the incongruity contrary to the promise of inheritance: faith (of which these things were said) is emptied of truth. The promise is abolished. He adds the promise above faith, for faith pertains to the execution of the promise, but the promise is prior. And therefore, heightening the incongruity, he says not only that faith is made void, but also that the promise is abolished or made void.

¶ How each follows he makes clear by adding: For the Law works wrath, that is, the Law punishes; for to work wrath is to bring about vengeance. And he proves this action of the Law by adding: For where there is no Law, neither is there transgression—supply: “imputed for punishment.” Both are clear of themselves: for the means of the Law (by which the Law draws men) is punishment, and experience testifies that in places or actions exempt from law, transgression is not imputed for punishment. Therefore the force of the reason consists in this, that because it belongs to the Law to punish—indeed because it is proper to the Law to punish—it belongs to the Law to disinherit, to deprive those unworthy of inheritance; and by this the non-fulfillment of the promise follows upon the action of the Law. For if men are deprived of inheritance, the promise is not to be fulfilled; and thus faith is made void, and the promise is abolished by the proper action of the Law.

¶ Therefore it is of faith. The Apostle sufficiently supposes the division: either the promise is to be fulfilled through the Law or through faith; and, with the Law excluded as tending by its own action to the contrary, he infers from the sufficient division: therefore it is of faith. And yet he adds an appropriate reason why the promise is to be fulfilled through faith, adding: that according to grace the promise might be firm to all the seed.

¶ The written Law not only diminishes the promise by punishing, but also fulfills the promise only according to the notion of debt, and that only for those subject to it. By contrast, faith, just as it is a disposition of man for God’s promising to him, so it is also what makes

CHAPTER FOUR

the promise firm; for a thing is made firm by the same things by which it is made. Hence, since the promise made to Abraham was from faith, it is most fitting that the execution also be made firm by faith. Again, since faith so disposes to the promise that the promise was not from debt but from grace, it follows that the fulfillment is also made firm by faith so that it may be firm according to grace, and thereby to all the seed. He therefore gives the reason why it is of faith, touching on all these points. For by saying, “that according to grace,” he excludes debt, since faith is imputed for justice according to grace. By saying, “might be firm,” he touches the act congruent to faith. And by saying, “to all the seed,” he includes both those under the Law and those without the Law, as he himself declares, adding:

¶ Not to that which is of the Law only, but also to that which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all, namely, of believers. As it is written: Book of Genesis, chapter seventeen: Because I have made you the father of many nations. These are God’s words to Abraham, written there. Before God whom he believed, that is, “before God whom he believed.” These words are not taken from Genesis, but are added by Paul to explain in what fatherhood God set Abraham as father of many nations. For he explains that it is not by a carnal fatherhood which is before men, but by a spiritual fatherhood which is before God, whom Abraham himself believed, that he was set as father of many nations. For this is the fatherhood by which Abraham is father of all believers.

¶ Who gives life to the dead, and calls those things which are not as though they were. If it must be rendered word for word, it should be read: “and calls non-beings as beings.” The first of these two points—“who gives life to the dead”—signifies a miracle of a deed: because at that time He gave life, for begetting, both to Abraham’s dead body and to Sarah’s dead womb. For this was when God said, “I have appointed you father of many nations.” But the other—“and calls those things which are not as though they were”—has regard to the promised sons of many nations: for among them some would be sons according to the flesh, but others would not; and yet God calls those things which are not as though

TO THE ROMANS

they were—He calls non-sons of Abraham as sons of Abraham—so that in this very thing spiritual fatherhood is signified.

¶ Who against hope believed in hope. The Greek texts do not wholly agree in words; nevertheless the sense comes back to the same if one reads: “Who beyond hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations.” For it is signified literally that beyond the hope of nature he believed that he would be father of many nations in the hope of the divine promise.

¶ Here a question arises: how does Paul now say that Abraham is father of us all because he was set father of many nations—speaking without doubt of spiritual fatherhood—yet now he says that the same Abraham was to be father of many nations by means of carnal generation? For without doubt he speaks of carnal generation when he says that beyond hope he believed in hope; indeed he explicitly adds about his dead body and Sarah’s womb.

¶ The solution is that Abraham’s spiritual fatherhood was to be fulfilled chiefly through faith in Christ; but Christ, according to carnal generation, was promised as Abraham’s son through Isaac. And therefore, for Abraham’s spiritual fatherhood, faith in Christ’s carnal generation from Abraham through Isaac was required. Hence these two do not oppose one another, but rather cohere: so that from the fact that he hoped, by begetting a son, that he would be father of many nations, we understand that he hoped, by begetting Christ, that he would be father of all believers.

¶ According to what was said to him: the “to him” is superfluous. The Apostle applies to Abraham’s hope, when he was ninety-nine years old, those things that had been revealed to him long before. And to signify this he says, “according to what was said,” that is, according to what had been said in past time: So shall your seed be. These words had been said by God to Abraham in Genesis, chapter fifteen, after first saying, “Look up to heaven and number the stars if you can.” For after those words He added: “So shall your seed be,” namely, innumerable like

CHAPTER FOUR

the stars. Like the stars of heaven and the sand of the sea. These six words are superfluous.

¶ And he was not weakened in faith. The word “was” and the preposition “in” are superfluous. Nor did he consider... The sentence must be continued, and it must not be read “nor,” but “not.” Thus the text is: “And he was not weakened in faith: he did not consider his body now dead, when he was already nearly a hundred years old, nor the dead womb of Sarah.” The sense is clear to one reading the history written in Genesis chapters seventeen and eighteen, and understanding that the discourse is about being dead with respect to begetting, and that by the name of “womb” one should understand not the womanly part that is shameful, but what physicians call the matrix.

¶ But if it is objected against these words of Paul—“he did not consider his dead body,” and so forth—that Abraham did consider these; for it is written in Genesis chapter seventeen that, when Abraham heard the promise of a son from Sarah, he fell upon his face and laughed, and said in his heart, “Shall a son be born to a man that is a hundred years old, and shall Sarah, who is ninety years old, bear?” In these words it appears that Abraham believed less by considering these things.

¶ The solution is that from the beginning of that revelation Abraham had not perceived it to be an affirmative revelation; and therefore he compared the impediments of nature, both in himself and in Sarah, doing so, however, not by believing less or doubting the promise of God, but by asking the meaning of the divine words, whether they were truly said to signify that which they sounded to signify. The sign of this is that Scripture adds that God afterward said, “Truly Sarah your wife shall bear you a son”; and then Abraham did not consider, as the Apostle says, and so forth. Thus the Apostle’s words are to be referred to the time of the completed revelation.

¶ In the promise, that is, “upon the promise,” or “with respect to the promise.” Also of God he did not hesitate through unbelief. From the added words—“therefore also it was reckoned to him for justice”—it is clear that the discourse here is about the promise written in Genesis

TO THE ROMANS

chapter fifteen, when it was said to him, "So shall your seed be," and "Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him for justice." For after he commended Abraham's faith without any wavering when he was ninety-nine years old, he now commends Abraham's faith also without wavering when long before the promise had been made to him that his seed would be innumerable like the multitude of the stars. And he added this commendation lest, perhaps, the commendation of the later faith be interpreted as a diminution of the earlier faith, especially because he had commended the later faith by recalling the earlier revelation. Therefore, to exclude this sinister interpretation, he commends all the more Abraham's faith in the first promise of his innumerable seed; hence he even says more, adding: But he was strengthened in faith. There he had said, "not weakened in faith"; here he says "strengthened in faith." Giving glory to God. To believe God is to give glory to God as true and powerful to fulfill. Most fully knowing, that is, made certain, or certified, that whatever God promised, He is able also to do. And it is insinuated through this that this vision was not a simple vision, but with an effect of certification of the supernatural power of God, specifically with respect to fulfilling that promise. For Abraham before that vision was certain of God's supernatural power in general, but then he is more certainly affected specifically concerning God's supernatural power with respect to fulfilling that promise.

¶ Therefore also it was reckoned to him for justice. Now it was not written for his sake alone that it was imputed to him for justice, but for ours also, to whom it shall be imputed, believing in Him who raised Jesus Christ our Lord from the dead. He repeats that a faith similar to Abraham's faith is required, not with respect to just any believed thing, but to Jesus Christ raised from the dead by God. And he adds the reason for the thing believed: Who was delivered up for our offenses, that is, who was delivered to death by God, by Himself, for our offenses to be destroyed; for it has already been said that the blood of Christ is the price of our redemption from slavery to sin. And rose again for our justification. Unless Christ had risen we would not have been justified

CHAPTER FOUR

from our sins, even though He had died and paid the price for us, because we would not have believed. But because He rose, we believe; and thus justification comes to us. And for that reason it is said that He rose for our justification, that is, so that justification might come to us.

¶ And most fittingly, in place of the imitators of Abraham's faith imputed for justice that remits sin, he sets those who believe in God through the mediator Jesus, justifying us from sins, so that faith corresponds to faith, imputation to imputation, and justice to justice.

TO THE ROMANS

CHAPTER V

¶ IV Therefore, having been justified by faith. Once that clause has been explained—namely, for the righteousness of God is revealed in it—that other clause proposed there is now explained: namely, for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone who believes. He treats this up to chapter nine. Hence, at the beginning of this chapter, he sets forth salvation in four goods that those justified by faith have through Jesus Christ, intending to treat, through these chapters, these four goods that we have through the grace announced by the Gospel. In this too it plainly appears that the Gospel, according to the reality evangelized, is the power of God unto salvation to everyone who believes.

¶ Let us have peace—read “let us have” instead of “we have”—with God. This is the first good in which the salvation of those justified by faith consists: for from the state of enmity toward God they have been transferred into a state of peace with God, so that they live with God as those who have peace are accustomed to live with princes with whom they are at peace.

¶ Through our Lord Jesus Christ. He declares the mediator of peace.

¶ Through whom we have—it must be read “we had,” and the conjunction “and” is missing, so that it must be read: through whom also we had access—that is, entrance. He declares Jesus to be the mediator not only of the peace of those justified, but also of access or entrance into the very grace of justification, so that we understand one and the same mediator in the way and in the term: that is, in the access and in the peace that follows.

¶ Through faith—read “through faith” instead of “by faith.” He explains that the mode of access was faith, so that through Jesus as mediator, through faith—that is, by believing—we had access.

CHAPTER FIVE

¶ Into this grace—namely, of justification. For it has already been said that by divine grace faith is imputed unto justification; and therefore through faith we had entrance into this grace of justification.

¶ In which we stand—read “we stand” instead of “we have stood.” Paul speaks in the person of those justified who persevere, numbering himself among them (as he truly was one of them), not without mystery, but so that we may perceive that these four goods are verified of those justified like him, and not of the imperfect, even though justified; so that from this each Christian may learn how much is lacking to him of perfect justification. For by contemplating these goods of those who are justified, we see our own imperfections.

¶ And we glory in the hope of the glory of God’s sons. The words “of God’s sons” are superfluous. The second good in which the salvation of those who believe, and who have been justified, consists is this: namely, to glory in the hope of the glory of God. And this glorying directly regards the glory of the heavenly fatherland, which the justified hope for; for that is properly the glory of God that is hoped for by us. Thus, this second good comprehends not only the hope of attaining divine glory in the heavenly fatherland, but also a glorying, and as it were a certain boasting of ours, in such hope. In this glorying, the security of attaining the thing hoped for is signified.

¶ And not only—supply: we have this glorying—but we also glory in tribulations—read “in tribulations” instead of “in afflictions.” Behold the third good of our salvation that the justified have here: namely, to glory in afflictions. The first glorying is with respect to future happiness in another life; but this is with respect to present evils of punishment. Again, the first glorying is by reason of the soul that hopes; but this is by reason of the body and the other external goods. For the Apostle insinuates through these things that the glorying of the justified with respect to the goods of the soul looks to future glory, but with respect to the goods of the body looks to present affliction; so that they do not glory in bodily goods or in external things, but in afflictions, both in the body and in things.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ Knowing. He manifests each glorying in a twofold way: namely, from the time of the Holy Spirit and from the side of the Son of God. He manifests the reason why each glorying is not vain, but is well founded, firm, and certain. He proceeds first by declaring, with an artful advance beginning from affliction, which is the matter of the second glorying, and passing through hope, which is the matter of the first glorying, and arriving at the charity of God through the Holy Spirit, which is the reason establishing each glorying. Consider the individual points.

¶ That tribulation—read “affliction”—works patience. Understand this materially and as an occasion: for affliction is the matter of patience and is the occasion for the virtue of patience to be exercised, just as an abundance of things is the matter of liberality and an occasion for the exercise of liberality.

¶ And patience works probation—as a cause an effect—whether “probation” is taken for making an experiment, or for its term, which is praise or commendation. Patience indeed effects both: for it both makes an experiment of a patient spirit, and renders the soul that endures proved, that is, praised.

¶ And probation works hope—as an occasion, by strengthening and increasing hope; for a proved soul is strengthened and increased in hope of the glory of God.

¶ And hope does not confound—read “does not make ashamed.” That is, it does not affect a man with shame; it does not make a man ashamed of his hope. For the force of the progress tends to this. For to one who considers attentively, Paul has artfully reduced each glorying to hope; and of hope itself he says that it does not make a man ashamed—without doubt, of his hope.

¶ Because the charity—that is, the love—of God is poured out—that is, is poured forth—in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us. Hope would make us ashamed of the hope we have concerning glory, unless we had firmness of our hope. But such firmness, by which we can attain the glory of God, depends on the love of God toward us. For it is certain that God can and knows how to communicate

CHAPTER FIVE

His glory to us; but everything depends on whether He wills it for us, which is to love us unto it. And therefore he manifests the solid foundation of hope from the love of God toward us, saying: because the love of God.

¶ And because the love of God toward us is distinguished according to the kinds of goods that God wills for us (for one is the love by which God wills us natural goods, and another by which He wills us the supernatural goods of grace and beatitude), therefore, to distinguish the divine love by which our hearts are disposed, he adds: is poured out in our hearts, that is, it has been lavishly bestowed according to its effects and likeness in our hearts, in the innermost parts of our souls. And he adds the mode of the pouring out, saying: through the Holy Spirit, not through the spirit of nature. And lest you suspect anything ambiguous or merely conjectured, he adds: who has been given to us.

¶ For Paul (as also the other Apostles and the justified who persevered in the beginning of the Church) had received the Holy Spirit with such an overflowing abundance of supernatural gifts that they experienced in themselves the love of God poured out in their own hearts, both in many supernatural gifts and in the chief gift of the likeness of God's love: that is, their love toward God. Hence it is clear that he explains the first foundation of hope as the love of God toward us, poured out richly in us through the Holy Spirit dwelling in us, in which our reciprocal love toward God is included as part of the pouring out.

¶ For why did Christ, when we were still weak...? The expression that is interpreted "for why" is ambiguous as to "still" or "also," that is, "further." And what is said, when we were still weak, rendered word for word, must be read: while we were weak. For this reason, there is a varied interpretation of the text: some read, for Christ, while we were still weak, and they refer the word "still" to the participle "while we were," so that the sense is: because Christ, while we were still weak. Others read: further, or also, or moreover, for Christ, while we were weak, and the sense is: besides what we have said about the love of God toward us through the Holy Spirit, there is another reason: because Christ, while

TO THE ROMANS

we were weak, and so forth. This expression is commonly taken in this latter sense, when a reason is joined to a reason, as Latin writers use “further,” “moreover,” or “also.” And in my judgment it fits this place sufficiently: for he adds, on the side of Christ, a reason to the reason already given on the side of the Holy Spirit. Yet the reading would be clearer if it were read: further, because Christ, while we were weak: that is, powerless (without doubt, according to the soul) for works of salvation.

¶ According to the time. The expression interpreted “time” signifies more than time: it signifies the opportune time, in the way we say of someone who came when it was fitting that he came “in time,” signifying that he came at a suitable time, at the time when he ought to have come. For Paul intends and signifies that Christ at the fitting time, at the time when it ought to be (so that He neither delayed nor came too soon), redeemed us by His death.

¶ He died for the impious. Gather three conditions: the first is the neediness of the human condition, signified by weakness; the second is the fittingness of the time; and the third is the impiety of men. And men are called impious by their impiety toward the heavenly Father and the fatherland.

¶ For scarcely for a just man someone dies—read “will die.” Paul weighs the fact that Christ died for the impious by this: that one rarely finds someone who would die for a just man. And if one rarely or never finds someone who would die for a just man, it follows that no one is found who would die for an impious man.

¶ But for a good man perhaps someone would dare to die—read “dares.” This whole discourse must be understood within the scope of voluntarily undergoing death for another man, and so it is bounded by two conditions. One is that a man chooses to die, and this in contrast to those who fight in battle: for those who fight do not choose to die, but fight so as to conquer, and would rather withdraw if they could. The other is that death is chosen for another, that is, for the sake of another’s salvation. For that is why he says that it is rare or none who would die for

CHAPTER FIVE

a just man; but for a good man—that is, for a man not only just but also endowed with goods of supererogation—perhaps someone would be found who dares to choose death. For example, perhaps one would have been found choosing to die in order to save Elijah; but in order to save any just man whatsoever, scarcely will one be found who chooses death. And in this Christ is commended, who chose to die, not for a good man nor for a just man, but for the impious.

¶ But God commends His charity toward us—read “toward us.” The force of the intended reason: having recounted the deed of Christ, he explains that also in this way God commends His love toward us. For in the prior reason the love of God toward us was declared with respect to what is inward in us; but in this reason it is declared with respect to what is external, such as the death of Christ.

¶ Because, when we were still sinners, Christ died for us at the fitting time. This love is manifest, and is made still more manifest from what has been said.

¶ Much more therefore now, having been justified in His blood. Behold the second foundation of hope, sufficiently clearly drawn out in the text. For hope is concerned with what is said:

¶ We shall be saved from wrath. That is, from the vengeance of the last judgment.

¶ Through Him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, having been reconciled, we shall be saved by His life. Let the prudent reader gather four names of the human race in this reason: for we are called weak, against power; impious, against good will; sinners, against rectitude of mind; and enemies, against the state in which we were established. And he multiplies arguments. For where earlier he argued from the contrariety of our qualities (in that He did this for the weak, the impious, sinners, and enemies), now, by gathering the points, he argues from the contrariety of the death and the life of Christ Himself: that if the death of Christ availed so much for enemies, much more will the life of Christ

TO THE ROMANS

who rose again avail for those already reconciled, unto the eternal salvation that they hope for. For this is the solid foundation of our hope.

¶ And not only. With respect to the two kinds of glorying previously mentioned and grounded, he says and not only, intending to add a fourth good that those justified by faith have, continuing by saying and not only: namely, we glory in tribulations.

¶ But we also glory in God. This is the third glorying. Thus the first good that comes to the justified is peace with God; and to this is joined a threefold glorying: the first in hope of the glory of God; the second in afflictions; and the third in God. And through these are constituted the four goods of the justified, through which the Gospel is the power of God for effecting salvation.

¶ Yet glorying in hope of the glory of God differs from glorying in God as the glory of God differs from God, as an effect differs from a cause. For the glory of God that we hope for is an effect of God, namely, the beatitude of the heavenly fatherland; but the justified glory not only by reason of the hoped-for beatitude, but by reason of God Himself (in whom the sum of all salvation consists), who is for them. From such things, and from such great goods of the justified, it appears that Paul speaks of the effects of justification not in any manner whatsoever, but (so to speak) in the highest degree. For these effects are not, properly speaking, in all who are justified, as is evident; but insofar as it is on the part of justification, they are in all the justified who stand (that is, who persevere), unless they themselves place an impediment.

¶ For this reason he signifiedly said in which we stand, namely, so that he might signify the justified who persevere—not in any manner whatsoever, but as Paul himself and those like him persevered. For this is why he speaks in the first person, numbering himself among the other justified who stand and have such gifts, as was said above.

¶ Through our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore the mediator is described in this last glorying, because He is the reason that we glory in God.

CHAPTER FIVE

¶ Through whom now. The time of the New Testament is indicated.

¶ We have received reconciliation: having been changed from the state of enmity into the state of peace.

¶ Therefore, just as through one man... Here he begins to treat the four goods of the justified that have been mentioned, beginning from peace. Hence he says therefore, that is, on account of this reconciliation that we have received as to be made. For the term of reconciliation is peace. And since peace signifies not an action or a passion, but the good of a tranquil state, the Apostle intends to describe the peace of the justified from the contrary state (that is, from the state of sin), by showing that the justified have attained a state of peace through Jesus Christ from a state of sin, in this order: first he shows that they have been freed from sin; then from the increase of sin; afterward from the external occasion of increasing sin, which is the law of Moses; and finally from the law of sin, though not from the side of the flesh; so that from the contrary he may make manifest what great good the justified attain.

¶ He therefore declares the common state of men in sin by taking up one likeness, whose other part is deferred, so that the text seems defective; yet it is not defective, but, the likeness having been begun, he continues this member until, by resuming this member, he explains the other member of the likeness there: therefore, just as through one man's offense... Let the adverb just as therefore remain suspended in the reader's mind as to that in which the likeness holds; and meanwhile let the learned reader observe that Paul excludes the points in which the likeness does not hold.

¶ To penetrate this more clearly, the intended likeness is between the offense of the first man and the righteousness of Christ. And before he declares in what respect the "just as" is verified, he excludes two respects in which the "just as" is not verified; and therefore the discourse appears defective, which in truth is not defective but suspended because of the exclusions inserted in the middle.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ And he says through one man (namely, Adam), although there were two human beings, the first parents, namely Eve and Adam, because he counts the woman as nothing, so that from this we may understand that if Adam had not sinned, even if Eve had sinned, the human race would not on that account have been infected.

¶ Sin entered into this world. The word “this” is superfluous. It is certain that the discourse is about the sin of Adam. And because that sin was at once actual and original, Paul uses it in this place in both ways: for by saying that through one man sin entered, he treats it insofar as it is original, for the actual sin had entered earlier through Eve, and earlier still through the devil.

¶ And through sin, death. In the book of Genesis it is clearly stated: “on whatever day you shall eat, you shall die the death,” that is, you will incur the necessity of dying. And thus through sin the punishment of death followed. And again, from this punishment it appears that the discourse is about the sin of Adam insofar as it is original, for the punishment of death inflicted upon him for his whole posterity bears witness that the sin whose punishment it is is imputed to him and to all his posterity.

¶ And so death passed to all men. It did not suffice for Paul to have said these two things—that sin and death entered into the world through one man; but lest you suspect that these entered the world and yet were not spread to all, he added that not only did they enter the world, but they passed to all men. And he adds this in a reverse order, beginning from death when he says, and so death passed to all men, and afterwards returning to sin when he says:

¶ In whom all sinned. The Greek expression that is interpreted “in” is ambiguous as to “because of” or “in,” and for that reason it can be read in either way: either “because of which all sinned,” or “in whom all sinned.” And if it is read “in whom,” know that the joining of these words in Greek yields the sense, in a certain way, of a single adverb or conjunction. Thus the sense is the same whether one reads “because of which” or “in whom.” Cicero is brought as a witness, who interprets these

CHAPTER FIVE

joined words as “because of which.” And this sense most fittingly accords with the context and the true meaning: for it signifies that death passed to all because all sinned—that is, because all sinned. Thus death is signified as common to all by reason of a sin common to all, lest you understand that the punishment of death is indeed common to all, but sin is not common to all. Paul does not will this to be understood, but that the punishment of death is common to all by reason of a sin common to all.

¶ For until the law. Once the commonness of both sin and death has been declared, he adds the diverse states of each in the world. One is from Adam until Moses; the other afterward. And although he makes both states known together (because once the one is made known, the other is made known from what follows), nevertheless he directly and explicitly pursues the state before the law first; afterward he will pursue the state under the law there where he says, but the law...

¶ The reason why Paul proposes not only the sin of the first man but also the diverse states of it is twofold. One is that from this he may show that through the grace of Christ men are freed not only from sin but from the abundance of sin that was under the law. The other is that from this he may have occasion to show that the grace of Christ, just as it frees from the abundance of sin, so it frees from the yoke of the law, which is the occasion for the increase of sin. Therefore the difference hinted at here implicitly and from consequence is twofold; and with respect to sin the difference consists in imputation and non-imputation, not in its existence. For this reason he says until the law, which includes the time of the first state:

¶ Sin was in the world. Thus Moses, who delivered this sin in the book of Genesis, did not invent this sin, but it was spread in the world before the law, just as after the law it was extended; and in this there is no difference.

¶ But sin was not imputed when there was no law—read: “but sin is not imputed when the law does not exist.” Behold the difference, declared from the common notion of law. It is common in every place

TO THE ROMANS

and at every time that when the law does not exist—whose role is to punish—sin is not imputed unto punishment. And therefore in the matter at hand this difference holds: that when the law of Moses did not exist, the sin that was in the world and common to all was not imputed unto punishment—indeed, even less: because it was not known. But once the law of Moses came, the sin that was in the world was imputed unto punishment, the law declaring it. For the discourse is about human imputation.

¶ But death reigned from Adam until Moses. Behold the difference with respect to death, and it consists in this: that from Adam until Moses death reigned; afterward it was regarded as punishment. Thus death was not reckoned as the punishment of sin, but as though it held a kingdom by a right of nature over all. But once the law of Moses came, death was known and regarded as the punishment of sin common to the human race.

¶ Even over those who did not sin in the likeness of the transgression of Adam. To explain clearly the commonness of sin in all without exception, both in little children and in the just, he says: even over those who did not sin in the likeness of Adam's transgression. For little children, although they have sin, nevertheless did not sin by a transgression like Adam's, because they never sinned actually. And the just, although they have sinned even actually, nevertheless did not sin by a transgression like Adam's, as those who never actually transgressed a precept of God, such as Adam's transgression was; for he transgressed a divine precept made to him.

¶ Who is the figure of him who was to come. The Greek expression is ambiguous as to "the one to come" in the masculine or in the neuter, as is also the Latin; and therefore the sense can be twofold. One is: "who is the type or figure of the future Adam," that is, of Christ. For the likeness has been begun: just as through one man... And the figure holds in this respect: that Adam was the father of sin and death, but Christ the father of righteousness and life. The other is: Adam is a type, that is, as it were an exemplary form, of future sin, because from him the sin of the whole

CHAPTER FIVE

human race is derived as from a type from which a form is impressed. Either is true; let the reader choose the sense he wishes. In either sense, however, “future” is said relatively, not with respect to Paul’s time, but with respect to Adam.

¶ But not as the offense, so also the gift. Before (as was said) he explains the likeness, he excludes the likeness with respect to each thing, namely, both with respect to sin and with respect to death. And the first dissimilarity consists in this: that he refers the sin of Adam to a limited punishment (namely, death), but on the other hand he refers the grace of Christ, from the grace of God, to an overflowing gift, so that we understand that the gift conferred through Christ upon the human race is far unlike the death inflicted upon the human race through Adam’s offense, because death is a certain definite punishment, but the gift of Christ is immeasurable. And for this he adds two causes of such redundancy: the principal, namely the grace of God; and the instrumental, namely the grace of the man Jesus Christ. Consider each.

¶ But not as the offense. Note the adverb “as,” because the dissimilarity is explained with respect to the manner.

¶ So also the gift—supply: of Christ.

¶ For if by the offense of one many died. Behold the manner by which the offense brings in death: namely, that the offense of one (Adam) was so powerful as to constitute many—indeed, the multitude of the human race—dead.

¶ Much more. Behold the beginning of the dissimilarity in a far greater power.

¶ The grace of God and the gift. Over against death he sets these two, to comprehend all the divine benefits, both external and internal, conferred upon the human race through Christ.

¶ In the grace of one man Jesus Christ. Against the offense of one man (Adam) he sets the grace of one man Jesus Christ, so that the more powerful grace is than offense, and the more excellent Christ is than Adam, the clearer the dissimilarity appears.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ Unto many—that is, unto many. No difference is signified as to the multitude of men, because on each side “many” is set forth.

¶ Has abounded—read “has overflowed.”

¶ And not as through one who sinned, so also the gift. The interpreters added the adverb and conjunction, “so also.” And by I know not what error it is read “through one sin,” instead of “through one who sinned.” Therefore it must be read thus: and not as through one who sinned, so is the gift. And the sense is: the gift is not like that which came through one who sinned. Here the second dissimilarity is excluded.

¶ And the dissimilarity consists in this: that the sin of Adam alone merited a divine judgment unto condemnation, but the gift of Christ responds to many offenses unto justification. For he intends to magnify the gift of Christ from this: that it sufficiently corresponds to the innumerable multitude of offenses of the human race, whereas condemnation from Adam corresponds to the offense of one man alone. Hence he says:

¶ For the judgment indeed—the divine sentence written in the book of Genesis against Adam—was from one—namely, from one sin—unto condemnation—as was imposed there.

¶ But the grace—that is, the gift—from many offenses—from the multitude of offenses of the human race—unto justification—of the multitude of men.

¶ For if by the offense of one death reigned through one. Then, gathering each dissimilarity so as to explain and add further, he forms the argument: that if by the offense of one death reigned through one,

¶ Much more they who receive the abundance—read “the overflowing”—of grace—without doubt, divine—and of the gift of righteousness—read “and of the gift of righteousness”—shall reign in life, against the kingdom of death, through one, Jesus Christ, against the one Adam.

¶ Therefore, as by the offense of one... With the dissimilarities explained, he resumes the begun likeness so as to complete it.

CHAPTER FIVE

¶ Unto all men. Behold the force of the likeness: that Adam's offense was an offense that by its own nature flowed out to all men, because although one sinned, he sinned as the head of human nature. And when he says unto all men, understand pure men, in distinction from Him who is both man and God.

¶ Unto condemnation. He says both that Adam's offense was unto all men and that it was unto condemnation, so as to explain the commonness of both, namely, of the offense and of the condemnation, that is, of the punishment.

¶ So also by the righteousness—read “the justification”—of one. He declares a proportional likeness, setting over against the offense of one man the justification likewise of one, without doubt, Jesus Christ.

¶ Unto all men. By its own nature the justification of Christ on the cross was unto all men, because He is the head of the whole Church from the beginning of the world to the end; and therefore His merit is by its own nature the merit of all, as to sufficiency.

¶ Unto the justification of life. Over against condemnation he sets not life simply, but justification of life, because in this time through the merit of Christ we do not attain the life of the body, but justification of life—indeed, a living justification even as to the body in the future age.

¶ For as by the disobedience of one man... He explains the likeness from the species of sin; and what he earlier called simply the offense of Adam, he now shows to have been disobedience. And it is fittingly called disobedience, because Adam's sin was not a sin from the object or matter: for that eating was not evil of itself, but because it was forbidden; and therefore it is ascribed to disobedience.

¶ Many were constituted sinners—read “we were”—many. He not only explains the species of Adam's offense, but also explains the manner in which that offense is imputed to the rest, saying that we were constituted sinners, so that without any ambiguity we may understand that not only the punishment of sin, but sin itself, all of us incurred through the disobedience of one. Here original sin is most clearly explained, for by saying that through the disobedience of one we were

TO THE ROMANS

constituted sinners, he most plainly signifies that through that disobedience we were conceived as sinners. For by saying we were constituted, he shows that without our works we were constituted sinners through his disobedience, which is for all of us to have original sin. Hence Paul also numbered himself in this multitude of the human race.

¶ So also by the obedience—read “obedience”—of one—without doubt, by which He was made obedient unto death, even death on a cross—many shall be constituted just, even without their own works, as is evident in the baptism of infants. Thus, as by the fact that men are generated from Adam they are constituted sinners, so by the fact that they are generated from Christ through baptism they are constituted just. And from this doctrine of Paul you have not only original sin common to all men, but also the righteousness of Christ common to all men, and thereby to infants; otherwise the sin of Adam would be more powerful than the righteousness of Christ, because that sin would extend to infants, but the righteousness of Christ would not extend to them—the opposite of which Paul teaches plainly. And note this concerning the baptism of infants.

¶ But the law entered in. Rendered word for word, it would be read: “but the law came besides.” For he intends and signifies the bad condition of the coming of the law—bad, I say, that is, beyond the intention. For although the law is holy and was given by God with intention for good, nevertheless with respect to the effect added here (namely, the abundance of sin) it came beyond the intention, because the lawgiver did not give it so that sin might abound. And therefore Paul, intending to treat of the law with respect to this effect, spoke most formally, saying: but the law came besides.

¶ This clause is therefore connected with the prior clause in which it was said: for until the law sin was in the world. For there Paul began to treat the diverse states of sin, namely, before the law and under the law. And having declared there the state of sin before the law, after pursuing

CHAPTER FIVE

the dissimilarities and likenesses he comes to the other member of the state of sin, namely, under the law.

¶ That the offense might abound. Behold the effect beyond intention; behold the state of sin under the law. And it abounded by bearing fruit: for original offense abounded more by bearing fruit under the law, as Paul will declare below.

¶ But where the offense abounded, grace did much more abound. The conjunction “and” is superfluous. Behold the reason why the Apostle treated the diverse states of sin, before the law and under the law. For because he treats of sin as that from which we have been freed through Christ, it was fitting that he show that we have been freed both from sin and from the increase or abundance of sin; and therefore it was necessary to make manifest the state of sin before the law and the state of the abundance of sin under the law, so that as from the state of sin he manifested the grace of Christ, so from the state of the abundance of sin he might manifest the superabounding grace of Christ.

¶ That as sin has reigned in death—read “unto death.” Observe that in the state before the law he had said: death reigned; now, in the state under the law, he says: sin reigned unto death. For then sin was not known, and death was regarded as reigning; but under the law, once sin and the punishment of death were known, death did not reign but was regarded as punishment. Sin, however, reigned, because sin abounded; and it reigned unto death, because it reigned so as to multiply death, adding the death of the soul to the death of the body.

¶ So also may grace reign through righteousness. Over against the reign of sin abounding under the law he sets grace against the law and righteousness against sin, so that you may also understand that grace does not abound in such a way as to exclude righteousness, but in such a way that it reigns in the men of the New Testament through the righteousness of faith.

¶ Unto eternal life. From this it appears that when he said sin reigned unto death, he intended eternal death; for grace does not reign

TO THE ROMANS

unto the perpetuity of the present life, but unto that life which of itself is eternal.

¶ Through Jesus Christ. Behold the mediator through whom grace superabounds and reigns unto eternal life.

CHAPTER SIX

CHAPTER VI

¶ “What therefore shall we say?” Paul simultaneously discharges two duties. For he both explains the efficacy of Christ’s gift with respect to sin, which abounded, and he is anxious to exclude the calumny of the powerless who taught that evils should be done so that goods might come. Hence he also takes from this an occasion to continue the text. For he had said, “Where sin abounded, grace superabounded.” And from this good fruit and end (namely, that grace might abound) someone could take a license to multiply sins so that grace might abound. Excluding this license, therefore, he adds: “What therefore shall we say? Shall we remain in sin so that grace may abound?” This is the license. Here note that “to remain in sin” and “to multiply sin” he uses as equivalent, because they mutually imply one another. It is clear, moreover, that he uses them for the same thing: because what he first called “sin abounding,” he now calls “remaining in sin.” And from this you have that these two mutually imply one another.

¶ “Far be it.” This is the response of one who recoils. “For we who...” “For” is superfluous. “We have died to sin.” “To sin” is the dative case here, as also below where the like expression is repeated a thousand times in various words. He gives a twofold reason, from the very superabundance of grace, that one must not remain in sin. Thus he intends to make plain that it is repugnant to the notion, or the cause, of grace’s superabundance to remain in sin. For which reason he assumes two effects of superabundant grace together with their causes, from which he forms two reasons. The first is that we have died to sin. And with respect to this effect he proceeds first, intending that just as Christ has died to mortal life, and so forth, so those who receive superabundant grace from Christ’s death have died to sin. For one who has died to someone no longer lives for that person, does not feel for that person, does not bear fruit for that person. And accordingly those are said to be,

TO THE ROMANS

and are, “dead to sin” who do not bear fruit for sin—those who, living a life subject to reason, do not live for sin.

¶ “How shall we still live in it?” This is an excellent argument drawn from death as a consequence. For just as one who is dead does not return to his former life, so one who is dead to sin ought no longer to live for sin; otherwise he is not truly dead, or he does not truly fulfill the office of one who is dead.

¶ “Or do you not know, brothers...?” “Brothers” is superfluous. He declares what he has assumed, namely that we have died to sin. “All of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus...” To distinguish it from the baptism of John, he says “into Christ Jesus.” And he adduces baptism to prove that we have died to sin, so that we may understand that in baptism such superabundance of grace is conferred that we die to sin.

¶ “We have been baptized into his death?” The Greek text is ambiguous both here and below as to whether it should be “in death” or “into death.” But here it makes no difference, because we have been baptized both into the likeness of Christ’s death and into the power of Christ’s death. “For we have been buried together with him through baptism in death”—or “into death.” From burial he declares death, from the rite of baptizing: because the one who is baptized is placed under water; and by this he bears the likeness of one who is buried, who is placed under the earth. Therefore, since one is buried only if he is dead, from the very fact that in baptism we are buried, we are made like Christ who was buried, or like him when he was buried. For this is what it signifies when he says: “For we have been buried together with him through baptism.” But what he adds—“in death” or “into death”—either explains the likeness, namely that we are buried as those who have died together with him, or it explains the power of baptism, which is “into death” with respect to sin, that is, it makes us dead to sin. This is the sense the accusative case conveys, namely “into death,” so that we may understand that baptism does not presuppose that we are dead to sin, but makes us dead to sin; and in this there is a dissimilarity between our death and burial and Christ’s death and burial. For Christ first died and

CHAPTER SIX

then was buried; but we, when we are baptized into Christ's death, are buried into death—that is, while we are buried we are made dead to sin. And this seems to be the sense directly intended by Paul.

¶ “So that as Christ rose from the dead through the glory of the Father...” Having declared the way in which we have died to sin, he declares the consequent obligation of not living henceforth in sin. He declares it by continuing the assimilation to Christ: so that as Christ rose from the tomb not to the conditions of his former life but “through the glory of the Father,” that is, by a glorious power and unto a glorious life—for Christ's former life was a life through the weakness of the flesh amid many ignominies and lowlinesses, but from the tomb he rose, that is, he came to life, not through a weakness of the flesh requiring what perishes, but through the glory of the homeland that endures—by touching the cause he describes the conditions of glorious life. “So we also may walk in newness of life.” Christ's glorious life into which he rose was a new life. And therefore Paul does not say, “so we also may walk in a glorious life,” but he soberly moderates the likeness to be imitated not as to glory but as to newness: so that those who cannot imitate the glory of Christ's life may imitate its newness.

¶ “For if we have been made co-planted with the likeness of his death...” The order of the text is: “For if we have been made co-planted with the likeness of his death.” And “co-planted” is not a participle, but has the force of a verbal noun. Paul intends to make clear the power of what he had just said: “that we may walk in newness of life.” And because to walk in new life is to make progress in the life of grace, he assumed a new metaphor signifying such progress. He assumed, however, the metaphor of trees planted together, as though Christ's death were one tree and his resurrection another tree. And he intends and says that if we have been made as though planted together with Christ who died, we shall likewise be planted together with Christ who rises. But because the likeness of planting together, if it is taken properly as planting together, is less suited to the purpose—for from the fact that one tree is planted alongside another, it does not draw its power from the other—therefore

TO THE ROMANS

“co-planting” is here to be understood as “grafting.” For among the Greeks this word is transferred to signify grafting, for this reason: that what is grafted into another tree is “co-planted” with it insofar as it becomes one plant with it. Of this sense the sign is that he does not say “co-planted with death,” but “co-planted with the likeness of his death.” And indeed those interpreted rightly who, instead of “co-planted,” said “grafted.” For the sense is that if we have been made grafted by assimilation to Christ’s death, we shall also be grafted by assimilation to his resurrection: if we have power from his death as though grafted, we shall also have power from his resurrection, just as a grafted branch has power from the plant into which it is grafted. “We shall also be [co-planted] with the likeness of his resurrection.” Supply: “co-planted.” And this grafting is that which gives us the power to walk in newness of life, because it gives the power of making progress. For being grafted into Christ’s resurrection draws power from Christ’s resurrection unto a life similar to Christ’s new life.

¶ “Knowing this: that our old man...” The first reason for not remaining in sin so that grace may abound was taken from this effect of superabundant grace, that we have died to sin; but this second reason is taken from the side of those things that belong to sin. And note well that I do not say “from the side of sin,” but “from the side of those things that belong to sin,” such as the consequences of sin—whether they are evil inclinations, or guilt, or whatever else the remnants of sin may be called. And he says that not only have we died to sin, but “our old man” also—that is, the remnants of sin in us. For whatever has been brought into us according to the soul from sin, Paul has called by a single word “oldness.” And rightly so: because oldness is a defect, is outside the intention, is contained within the ordering of evil, and according to the truth it is in us from the ancient sin of our first parent. Therefore when he says “our old man,” he signifies the soul, not according to substance but according to the oldness contracted from sin.

¶ “Has been crucified together [with him].” The adverb “together” is referred both to the time when we died to sin and especially to Christ’s

CHAPTER SIX

crucifixion, as though it had been said: together with Christ when he was crucified. He does not say “has died,” but “has been fixed to the cross,” so that we may understand that although we have died to sin, nevertheless our old man is not dead but crucified. And indeed that it is not dead we experience; hence below Paul will cry out: “Unhappy man that I am,” and so forth. But it is as though fixed to the cross, impeded from the works of oldness. And to explain more clearly this condition not of death but of crucifixion, he adds two fruits, or ends, of this crucifixion. The first is: “So that the body of sin may be destroyed.” However much we have died to sin through baptism according to the soul, nevertheless our body remains “a body of sin”; hence below he says: “I see another law in my members resisting the law of my mind.” Therefore, to destroy our body—not according to substance but insofar as it is of sin—our old man has been crucified: that is, a diminution and an impediment granted to our soul from Christ’s cross, according to that which it has of oldness, is granted for this end, that it may overflow also to destroying in the body that which is of sin. This happens by continually subjecting the flesh to the spirit from Christ’s cross.

¶ “So that we may no longer serve sin.” Behold the other fruit or end, to which the preceding is subordinated: for the body of sin is to be destroyed for this purpose, that we may no longer serve sin. He does not say, “so that we may no longer sin” (since this is impossible in the present state), but he says, “so that we may no longer serve sin,” as servants serve a lord. And by this possible end in this life he moderates the previous end, namely, “to destroy the body of sin.” For this seems impossible in the present state, just as “not to sin” does. But to destroy it as much as is required for this—namely, that we not serve sin—is not impossible, but has been granted to many perfect men.

¶ “For he who has died has been justified from sin.” Having brought forward two reasons why one must not remain in sin so that grace may abound—because the notion of superabundant grace both in us and in our old man is repugnant to remaining in sin—Paul now proceeds to pursue each reason individually, descending to the realities

TO THE ROMANS

themselves. And first the first. Here observe that the first reason (namely, that we have died to sin through baptism, and so forth) is, according to the form of speech, more like a bond of profession and a debt arising from profession than like the thing itself; for it sounds of the rite of baptism in the likeness of Christ's death and burial and of such assimilations, just as if we were to say to those who profess that they have put on a black garment, that they have prostrated themselves face-down on the ground, and the like. But now he pursues such death and life by explaining the things themselves. And therefore he says: "For he who has died has been justified from sin." Behold the reality of baptism; behold the reality of death, namely, justification from sin; so that from the justification itself received, the metaphor of our death to the likeness of Christ's death may be more fully understood and applied.

¶ "But if we have died with Christ..." Understand proportionally: he died to the prior life; we have died to sin. "We believe..." What he earlier called a debt from received baptism, he now explains as what follows from Christ's grace. And therefore he says "we believe," because, being justified and having died with Christ, we confidently trust without doubting. "That we shall also live with him"—the life of grace. And he says "we shall live with Christ," although he exists in heaven, because we trust that our life here will be a heavenly manner of life. And likewise, just as to die with Christ is to imitate his death, so to live with Christ is to imitate the newness of his life. And again, just as to die with Christ is to lean upon Christ's death, so to live with Christ is to lean upon Christ's life by which he lives and reigns.

¶ "Knowing that Christ..." Proceeding, he explains the conditions of the new life to be imitated. "Rising"—that is, having been raised from the dead—for Christ does not rise again, but has risen. "No longer dies; death will no longer have dominion over him." The translator has interpreted the same word in diverse ways. For in both places the Greek text has the same, except that the present has been changed into the future. It should therefore be read: "He no longer dies; death no longer has dominion over him." And he excludes from Christ raised from the

CHAPTER SIX

dead two things: actual death, and the dominion of death over him. And it was not enough to exclude death, because after the universal judgment it will be common to all men not to die anymore; but exemption from the dominion of death will not be common to all. For death will then have dominion in all those who will pay punishments continually and will never die. Therefore to exclude every possible penal condition, it is added: “death no longer has dominion over him.” For penalties are under the dominion of death.

¶ “For as to what he died...” He declares from the proper causes of Christ’s death and life the conditions he has stated. And first from the cause of death: “For as to what Christ died—he died to sin once.” That is, for the purpose of taking away sin it suffices that he died once. Here he at once touches the cause of Christ’s death, namely, that it was to take away sin; and that it suffices for taking away sin that he died once. And he proved this in no other way, because hence—namely, from the sufficiency of Christ’s death—and thence—namely, from the acknowledged weakness of sin among those who know it—it is known per se, as though from the terms: it suffices that he died once. The sense comes to the same (though not as clearly) if it is read in the neuter gender: “For as to what has died”—namely in Christ—“it has died to sin once.” Indeed the Greek text admits either reading. “But as to what he lives, he lives to God.” Here it appears that it must be punctuated as we have punctuated it. For just as he says “as to what he lives,” so before he said “as to what he died”; and just as now he adds “he lives to God,” so then he added “he died to sin.” Over against sin as the cause of Christ’s death, he places God as the cause of the new life into which Christ rose, so that we may understand by reasoning from opposites that Christ died in a manner proportioned to sin, by dying once; and similarly he lives in a manner proportioned to God, by living forever. For God, as far as concerns himself, is an unfailing author, end, and reason of life; and therefore one who lives to God has an unfailing reason of life. Whereas one who dies to take away sin, by the very fact that he has taken away sin, has no reason to die again.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “So you also consider...” In a single adverb of likeness he comprehends all that has been said above about Christ both dead and raised from the dead. “Yourselves indeed to be dead to sin.” It is not enough to be dead to sin; one must also reckon oneself to be dead to sin; one must so conduct oneself in one’s life and actions as one who reckons himself dead to sin. Thus such reckoning is not speculative but practical. Just as if it were said: Consider—by your life, morals, and all your acts—yourselves to be dead to sin, thus (that is, as) Christ died once without return to death, without the dominion of death. “But living to God,” exercising ceaselessly whatever belongs to your life for God, unto the honor of the divine name, and so forth. “In Christ Jesus.” “Our Lord” is lacking. That is, leaning not on your own powers but on the merits and protection of Christ Jesus our Lord, whose care is for us.

¶ “Therefore let not sin reign...” He pursues what pertains to the second reason, concerning the crucifixion of our old man. And because he had said that under the law sin reigned with sin’s abundance, therefore now, with our old man crucified (that is, with the reason for sinning diminished, since on the one hand and the other we are dead to sin), it follows that you should so conduct yourselves that sin does not reign. He does not say that sin is not present, but that sin does not reign—that it does not hold principality and dominion.

¶ “In your mortal body, so that you obey it in its desires.” Two words are missing. It should be read: “so that you obey it in its desires.” The pronoun “it” is feminine in Greek, that is, it refers to sin. But “its” is neuter, and refers to the body. Above he had said: “Our old man has been crucified so that the body of sin may be destroyed, so that we may no longer serve sin.” Now he explains that the “body of sin” is the mortal body, and that “to serve sin” is to serve sin according to the desires of the body. And as there, so here too, he adds a qualification: he requires that sin not reign in the mortal body—not by totally excluding it from reign (since this is impossible in this life), but by excluding it from reign in such a way that obedience to sin according to the body’s desires is withdrawn. For obedience is a species of servitude. As if he had said more

CHAPTER SIX

openly: I do not demand that the reign of sin be exterminated from your body, but I demand that obedience be withdrawn from it—that is, voluntary compliance in the body's desires. So that even if the body of sin desires, you nevertheless do not obey sin in such desires. Here he aptly joins both—namely, the body's desires and sin—so that we may understand that it is evil to obey the body's desires insofar as they are as if they were the commandments of sin. And this is to distinguish those same affections insofar as they are natural.

¶ “And do not present”—that is, “present”—“your members.” To obey is an interior act of the will; but to present one's members is an exterior act of execution. Paul forbids both, adding: “and do not present your members.” “As weapons of iniquity to sin.” Sin, since it is in itself weak and impotent, needs to be armed in order to carry out iniquities. But it is armed when members that were established for the works of nature are transferred into the service of sin. For this is precisely for the members to become the weapons of sin, rendering sin itself strong and warlike. And he adds “of iniquity” to explain the injustice of such presentation: for to present weapons of iniquity is unjust by its very kind. “But present yourselves to God as living from the dead, and your members as weapons of justice to God.” In keeping with the two things he had mentioned (namely, you and your members) with respect to sin, he repeats both as to be presented to God.

¶ “For sin shall not have dominion over you.” Observe the disparity: sin as related to our mortal body, and sin as related to us. For regarding sin as related to the mortal body, he warned us that we should strive that it not reign in our mortal body so that we obey it in the body's desires; but regarding sin as related to us, the baptized, and so forth, he asserts that it shall not have dominion over us. And he not only asserts it, but he adduces it as a reason for the foregoing exhortation, signifying this by the conjunction “for.” Thus from the fact that sin shall not have dominion over you, the ability to strive that sin not reign in your mortal body in such a way, and so forth, is signified.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ He proves this assertion (namely, that sin shall not have dominion over you) by adding: "For you are not under the law, but under grace." This reason fits the statement he had made above, that under the law sin reigned. For from the opposite it follows that where one is not under the law, sin lacks dominion. And because Paul clearly uses "law" against "grace," and "to be under the law" as opposed to "to be under grace," note first that by the name "law" is understood the law of Moses, as is clear from the fact that he adds that the law says: "You shall not covet." But the law of Moses is understood not in part (for example, ceremonial or judicial precepts), but in its entirety, including even moral precepts, as the words "You shall not covet" prove: for it is evident that this negative precept of the law is moral.

¶ Note second the difference between being under the law and being bound to observe certain things contained in the law, because they greatly differ from one another. For to be under the law is to be subject to the law, as is clear. But one can be held to observe many things contained in the law from another origin and bond. And this stands together with being absolved from, or free of, the law, as is clear in the case of the Gentiles: they were bound to observe moral precepts ("Honor your father," "You shall not kill," "You shall not covet," and so forth), not because they were subject to the law of Moses in which these precepts are contained, but from another source, namely, because the rule of natural reason required these. Paul does not say, "You are not bound to whatever is contained in the law," but he says, "You are not under the law," so that we may understand that we who are baptized are indeed absolved from subjection to the law of Moses, yet not therefore free from the bond of observing many things contained in the law. For we are obliged both as to guilt and offense against God, and as to punishment and liability to eternal damnation.

¶ Note third that to be under the law, as opposed to being under grace, is the name of a legal state, which is made up of three conditions. The first is the subjection of man to the Mosaic law. The second is the negation of divine assisting grace, insofar as the law commanded but did

CHAPTER SIX

not supply by its own works any assisting grace, as is clear from what Paul said above, that from the works of the law no one is justified. The third, following from this, is that man under the law was left to himself, as not helped by the interior gift of divine grace. And by these do not understand, as a novice, that the Jews existing under the law before Christ's advent lacked grace, for we do not say this; but understand that from that state they did not have grace as such; rather, those who had grace had it from participation in the new state to be revealed through Christ. They participated in the state of the New Testament by faith and devotion toward the mediator of God and men, the Messiah. And nevertheless the last two conditions remain, which, when expressed by the term "to be under the law," are understood from the very opposition to being under grace. For it is clear that to be under grace is the name of the state of men under the shadow of divine grace's protection and gift, by which we live interiorly with spiritual life. And from the very fact that it is opposed to being under the law, it shows the negation of grace under the law. Therefore, by joining these two ("you are not under the law, but under grace"), there is signified a state exempt from the yoke of the law, supported by divine grace; and a reason is given why sin shall not have dominion over you: namely, because you are not in the state of abounding sin, of the negation of grace, of being left to yourselves, but in the state of protection and gift of divine grace. From this it comes about that sin does not have dominion over us, over our voluntary powers and actions.

¶ "What then? Shall we sin because we are not under the law but under grace?" He had said that two goods are conferred on us by Christ's grace with respect to the law. One is the superabundance of grace; the other is exemption from the law. And with respect to the first he had raised and resolved the question: "Shall we remain in sin so that grace may abound?" Now he raises a similar question with respect to the second: "Shall we sin because we are exempt from the law?" And significantly he says "shall we sin," and he does not say "shall we transgress the precepts of the law." For once one is freed from the law, transgression

TO THE ROMANS

of the law's precepts is not what must be feared, but rather one must beware lest one sin: for to sin is to make one's actions crooked away from the rectitude of reason. Hence we may understand that he is speaking of those things that are sins in themselves, namely, things morally evil. And the reason for the question is lest someone think it lawful for those baptized in Christ Jesus to do moral evils because they are not under the law.

¶ “Far be it.” This is the response of one who recoils. “Do you not know that... to whom you present yourselves as servants for obedience, you are servants of him whom you obey?” He gives the reason for the response. And it consists in this: that sinning reduces a man to the servitude of sin, but living rightly leads to the servitude of justice and of God; hence we may understand that exemption from the law through Christ's gift is contrary to sin, and conversely; but living rightly accords with exemption from the law, and conversely. He begins, therefore, from the common condition of our voluntary actions: namely, that to whom a man subjects himself by obeying, of that one he becomes a servant. And specifying in each genus, he adds: “whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto justice.” Here some disparity intervenes: for in the genus of evils he names two things, sin and the punishment of sin, death; but in the genus of goods, over against sin he places obedience, and over against death he does not place the reward of life, but justice. And indeed he fittingly sets obedience against sin, because every sin is some disobedience; but he sets justice against death, so that we may understand that the discourse is not about the death of the body but about the death of the soul (for life of justice is opposed to death of the soul), and we may weigh that the actual punishment of sin is the death of the soul. And conversely, the present actual reward of obedience is that the soul lives with the life of justice. Therefore the force of the proposition assumed stands in this: if a man presents himself to obey sin, by that very fact he becomes a servant of sin unto death; and similarly, if he presents himself to obey (that is, to comply with) God, by that very fact he becomes a servant of obedience unto justice.

CHAPTER SIX

¶ “But thanks be to God.” “Thanks” is taken for the giving of thanks. Here note that although he had proposed the major of this argument absolutely, he assumes the minor by adding thanksgiving to God, so that we may understand that they obeyed not from their own striving and powers but from God’s gift, according to that saying of Hosea, chapter 13: “Your destruction is from yourself, but your salvation is from me.” “That though you were servants of sin, you have obeyed from the heart.” It is not matter for thanksgiving that you were servants of sin, taken absolutely, but joined with the following obedience, that is, that you have been transferred from the servitude of sin by obeying, not feignedly but from the heart.

¶ “That form of doctrine...” That is, according to that form of doctrine. “To which you have been handed over.” The Greek manner of speaking admits this; for Latins it is inept; but it is changed because of the mystery. For it signifies that it is not so much that the form of evangelical doctrine has been handed to men, as that men have been handed over to the form of evangelical doctrine, so that the shaping power of evangelical doctrine is signified as obtaining primacy and dominion over men, and not conversely. “But having been freed from sin, you have been made servants to justice.” “To justice” is the dative case. According to the two things assumed in the major (namely, the action and the consequent state), he likewise assumes two things: first the action — “you have obeyed that form,” and so forth; now the state consequent upon such obedience, namely, exemption from sin and servitude or dedication to justice. From all these you have the prudent reader’s response, as we summarized it: sinning makes a man a servant of sin; but to live evangelically makes a man a servant of justice.

¶ “I speak in a human way.” Although the duty ought to be exacted more strictly, yet he moderates the mandate, saying: I speak in a human way. “Because of the weakness of your flesh.” Behold the reason for the moderation. And he intends to explain more plainly to what sin leads and to what evangelical obedience leads. The necessity of this admonition is this: because above he had commanded two things (one,

TO THE ROMANS

“present yourselves to God,” the other, “and your members as weapons of justice to God”); after he has pursued the first by explaining “to whom you present yourselves for obedience,” he now pursues the second. And therefore he says: “For just as you presented your members...” This clearly concerns the exterior execution that is carried out through bodily members. And by saying “just as,” he admonishes a proportional manner both in thoughts and affections, in studies and watchfulness, by which they employed themselves in presenting their own members.

¶ “To serve uncleanness.” From this it is apparent that he is speaking of venereal sins. “And to iniquity.” He adds the genus to the species, amplifying the discourse. And nevertheless, because of the special foulness of venereal sins, he mentions uncleanness specifically as though it were a certain peculiar filth. “Of the members.” “Unto iniquity.” This is referred to both of the preceding. And the sense is: unto the consummation of iniquity. For desired uncleannesses and universally iniquities present the members as serving to consummate iniquity, or to incur a state of iniquity.

¶ “So now”—that is, proportionally; now, as baptized and dedicated to justice—“present your members to serve justice unto sanctification.” Over against both uncleanness and iniquity he places justice; and over against “unto iniquity” he places “unto sanctification.” For the fruit of actual justice exercised through the members is sanctification, that is, to be made clean, a clean state. He admonishes, therefore, that with a like proportional diligence, zeal, affection, watchfulness, and so forth, they now present the members of the body to serve recognized justice, to carry out good works unto sanctification, unto their own cleansing, unto the pursuit of a clean state, of which it is written: “Blessed are the clean of heart.”

¶ “For when you were servants of sin, you were free from justice.” “From justice” is the dative case. And the sense is that the state of sin’s servitude exempted you from justice: for one who is “free from justice” is called one exempt from justice, namely, one over whom justice does not rule, and whom perhaps no justice restrains. Having proposed the

CHAPTER SIX

admonition, as it were human, he adds the conditions of the parts—of sin on the one hand, of justice on the other—so that it may be known how “human” it was not to demand more. And the first condition is described with respect to the state of servitude; the second with respect to fruit, saying: “What fruit therefore did you have then in those things of which you are now ashamed?” Not only does the servitude of sin exempt from justice, but it also produces a fruit always joined with repentance, indeed with shame, saying: “of which you are now ashamed.”

¶ The third condition is described with respect to the end, adding: “For the end of those things is death.” Understand “the end of those things” not as intended by men who sin, but as the end to which sins by their own nature lead. For death—both of the soul and of eternal damnation—is the most proportionate end of sins. “But now, having been freed from sin and made servants to God, you have your fruit unto sanctification, but the end, eternal life.” In due order he sets the three opposite conditions over against one another, sufficiently clear. For against the state of which he had said, “servants of sin, free from justice,” he directly sets: “freed from sin, made servants to God.” Against what he had said, “What fruit therefore...?” he sets: “you have your fruit unto sanctification.” Finally, against what he had said, “the end of those things is death,” he sets: “but the end, eternal life.”

¶ “For the wages of sin is death.” Paul, mindful of the likeness assumed above (when he said: “do not present your members as weapons of iniquity to sin”), now mentions wages, saying: “For the wages of sin is death.” For to those who present weapons to sin, wages are owed by sin. Therefore, not departing from the office of the members, and at the same time declaring what he had said—“the end of those things is death, but your end eternal life”—he explains that the reward which is rendered by sin as wages to those who arm it with their members, who wage war for it with their members, is death: both the death of the soul (which consists in the separation of the soul from God) and eternal torment, which consists in the punishments of hell. And he speaks of actual sin. For if

TO THE ROMANS

original sin is also included, among the wages of sin is also the death of the body.

¶ “But the gift of God is eternal life.” He does not say “the wages of justice is eternal life,” but “the gift of God is eternal life,” so that we may understand that we attain eternal life as our end not from our merits but from God’s gratuitous gift. For which reason he also adds: “In Christ Jesus our Lord.” Behold the merit; behold the justice whose wages is eternal life; but for us it is a gift by reason of Christ Jesus.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CHAPTER VII

¶ “Do you not know, brethren?” He had said above, “not under the law”; and he had not made this clear, but immediately he treated the question, “Shall we sin because of this freedom?” Therefore, once the question has been treated, he makes clear what he had assumed, namely: “You are not under the law.” And in order to make this clear, he introduces a general rule about law, sufficiently known to those who are accustomed to live under law: “For I speak to those who know the law, that the law has dominion over a man for as long as he lives.” This is the general rule. In it, the word “lives” is ambiguous as referring either to the man or to the law. Nevertheless, it matters little or nothing to the force of the sense, for either construction returns to the same meaning. For if it is understood, “for as long as the law lives,” that is, has coercive force, it is truly said; and likewise if it is understood, “for as long as the man lives,” it is truly said—provided you understand “life” not of nature but of the life of a state. For as long as a man lives in a military state, the military law has dominion over him; and as long as a man lives in the married state, the law of marriage has dominion over him; and so with similar cases. And this is seen to come to the same thing as the former, “for as long as the law lives.” For when the married state ceases in a man, the law of marriage no longer lives for him. And although this coincidence is true, nevertheless those words added in the text assert that “lives” is referred to the man. For both in the example of the married woman, and in applying it to the principal intention, a change of the man’s state under the law is presupposed; and according to that change St. Paul judges an exemption from the law. Therefore the sense of the rule is that the law has dominion over a man as long as the man lives according to that state which the law directs. “For the woman who is under a husband is bound to the law while her husband lives; but if her husband has died, she is loosed from the law of her husband. Therefore, while her husband lives, she will be

TO THE ROMANS

called an adulteress if she is with another man; but if her husband has died, she is freed from the law of her husband, so that she is not an adulteress if she is with another man.” He makes the rule clear by the example of the married woman, who is loosed from the law by a change of state. And although many examples were available, St. Paul chose this one because according to this example he intends to manifest his principal purpose. The letter is sufficiently clear. In it the interpreter has added certain words that do no harm. Yet let the reader carefully note that these words of St. Paul are understood as a general rule; but otherwise in a case. St. Paul knew, and those learned in the law of Moses (whom he addresses) know, that according to the law it is generally true that a woman is bound as long as her husband lives; and with this they know that, in the case of a bill of divorce according to the law, the woman was loosed from the law of her husband even while the husband lived. For St. Paul uses the rule of the law, keeping silent about case-based exceptions.

¶ “Therefore, my brethren.” He applies to the proposed matter both the rule and the example. “And you also have been made dead to the law.” He does not in every respect apply the example explicitly. For in the example there are, as it were, four persons: the law, the woman, her husband, and the other husband to whom, after the first had died, she could be joined. But in this application, the law indeed is present; and likewise, in the place of the woman are the baptized; in the place of the second husband is Christ, who rose from the dead; but in the place of the first husband death is insinuated, since it is added, “to bear fruit unto death.” For a woman bears fruit to her husband. Therefore, when it is said, “and you have been made dead to the law,” the law is not introduced as if it were the first husband; but, as is his manner, St. Paul proposes the intended conclusion, saying that you, the baptized, have been made dead to the law of Moses. For this is the conclusion to which he tends. And it is the same to say “you have been made dead to the law” and to say “you have been exempted from the law”; for that very being made dead is an exemption.

CHAPTER SEVEN

¶ “Through the body of Christ”: not through your works, but through the death which the body of Christ endured. For the death of Christ renders all the baptized dead to the law; and this is to make them dead to the law. “So that you may belong to another, who rose from the dead.” He alludes to the example introduced: just as a married woman, through the death of her husband, is made dead to the law of marriage, so that she may lawfully belong to another husband, so you through the death of Christ have been made dead to the Mosaic law, so that you may belong to another, namely, to the new man who rose from the dead. “So that you may bear fruit”—that is, “so that we may bear fruit—to God.” And this too pertains to the example: for the woman joined to the second husband bears fruit to him; and so we should bear fruit to God, not to death.

¶ “For when we were in the flesh.” Up to this point he has narrated; now he proves from the difference between each state. And what he previously called the state “under the law,” he now calls the “carnal state,” because, as he said above and will declare below, the law came in so that sin might abound; and to be “under the law,” as it is opposed to being “under grace” (as was explained beforehand), includes in itself the negation of grace, and leaves a man to himself in his carnality. Nor by saying “when we were in the flesh” does he speak of being in the flesh as to substance (for even the baptized are in the flesh as to substance); but he speaks of being in the flesh as to state, that is, when we were in a purely carnal state, without the aid of grace. For such was the state under the law.

¶ “The passions of sins.” Many think it should be read “the affections of sins”; and indeed this contributes to the clarity of the letter. Yet as to the thing signified it makes no difference, because both “passions” and “affections” signify those things we call passions of the soul—anger, sorrow, delight, desire, and the like—when immoderate. For such are properly passions of sins, affections of sins, diseases of the soul, and the like. “Which were through the law.” If one reads “affections of sins,” one should accordingly read “which were through the law,” for the

TO THE ROMANS

relative does not refer to sins but to the passions. The manner in which the affections of sins were through the law will be declared by St. Paul below; for the present it suffices to know that the manner is that we strive toward what is forbidden. For the affections of our soul, when the law forbids, are stirred up to sin; and therefore they are described as being “through the law.” The sense is that the passions of sins were stirred up through the law. “Worked in our members.” For the affections of the soul, because they occur with bodily change, work within by moving our members, whether by becoming angry, or fearing, or desiring, and the like. “So that they might bear fruit unto death,” that is, so that our members might produce fruit not for God but for death. Behold the condition of the state under the law: namely, that because we were in pure flesh, immoderate affections, stirred up on the occasion of the law, worked not only in our souls but also in our members, so that they might bring forth fruit for the death of the soul and eternal damnation. Here, learned reader, you can perceive the reason from the carnal state and from the occasion of the law.

¶ “But now.” Behold the condition of the new state through Christ. “We have been loosed from the law of death.” The letter is corrupt. It must be read “dying,” so that the complete text is: “We have been loosed from the law, dying, in which we were held.” And the participle “dying” is referred to “loosed,” so that the sense is: “but now we have been loosed from the law in which we were held, by dying.” And, in contrast to what he had said, “when we were in the flesh,” he says, “but now, dying”; and in contrast to what he had said, “the affections which were through the law,” he says, “we have been loosed from the law in which we were held.” And he means that, dying in baptism to sin and to those things that belong to sin (which happens through the power of Christ’s death), we have been loosed from the law of Moses in which we were held while the passions increased. “So that we may serve in newness of spirit.” We have not been loosed from the law so that we may have license for the flesh, but so that we may serve in newness of spirit. And he says this against what he had said, “they worked in our members to bear

CHAPTER SEVEN

fruit unto death.” Nor does he only say “in newness,” but “in newness of spirit,” so that we may understand a spiritual newness, a newness of life according to the spirit, whose property is to tend toward the highest goods. “And not in the oldness of the letter.” He says this directly against the law of Moses—not disparaging it, but declaring its state to be a state of oldness, which is true both by reason of the oldness it leaves in man, not conferring grace, and by reason of the oldness which it stirs up or increases by occasion. Thus we understand from this difference between the newness of spirit and the oldness of the written law (which for that reason is called “letter”) that the state we have obtained through Christ is opposed to the state under the law, just as newness of spirit is opposed to the oldness of the letter.

¶ “What then shall we say?” After he has declared that the baptized are not under the law, from the imperfect conditions of the state under the law that are opposed to the perfect conditions of the state under grace, he adds a question. “Is the law sin?” that is, is the law evil? And there is an occasion for the question, both because it was said that the law came in so that sin might abound, and because it was said that “the affections of sins which were through the law worked in our members to bear fruit unto death.” For from these, at first glance, it seems that the law is evil; and therefore he raised the question in order to exclude this sense. “Far be it.” It is a thought to be abhorred. “But I did not know sin except through the law.” Whether the discourse is universally about sin or specifically about some genus of sin (for example, an interior act), the sense is: sin, insofar as it is an offense against God, insofar as it is to be punished by God, I did not know except through the law. For apart from the law of Moses (of which he speaks, as is clear from what follows) men knew not only that murders and the like are sins, but also that interior acts are sins, as is evident in the books of the philosophers. But they did not know sin according to the first notion of guilt, by which it is an offense against God, nor according to the first liability of punishment, by which it deserves eternal damnation. For this is commonly known through the law. And I say “commonly” to distinguish certain faithful

TO THE ROMANS

outside the law, who were divinely instructed. And the discourse is of knowledge not so much speculatively as practically, by which we know those things forbidden by the law as not to be attempted by us. For the law directly produces such knowledge even with respect to those things that were previously known to be evil. For through the law they are known as to be avoided because they are to be punished; for punishment is the law's proper means. Therefore the law produces knowledge of sin as to be avoided, as to be punished.

¶ “For I did not know concupiscence.” He proves by an example in one special genus of sin. And he adduces the sin of interior concupiscence, in which the force of the law's making known is more manifest. For no human law punishes interior acts. Hence, when he says, “For I did not know concupiscence,” he does not mean concupiscence absolutely, but concupiscence as sin punishable. And he speaks of concupiscence both for another's property and for lust, as is clear from the authority of the law appended: “Unless the law said, ‘You shall not covet.’” Hence it clearly appears that he speaks of the law of Moses, in which this precept is written in Exodus 20. “But sin, taking occasion.” He does not say “occasion given” (for the law does not give occasion to sin), but he says “occasion taken,” because from the knowledge had through the law we took occasion to sin. “Sin.” Behold who took occasion. And by the name “sin” is signified the interior tinder, that is, the lower part of the soul tending toward delightful good according to sense or the world. For this part is called “sin” for many reasons: causally, either because it is the cause of sin, or because it is an effect of the first sin of the parent; formally, insofar as it is part of original sin. This part of the soul, called “sin,” is what took occasion. “Through the commandment”: not as an instrument, not as a means used for this, but as something to be repelled by the contrary. So that you may understand this more clearly, note that because it is natural for each thing to rise against its own proximate contrary (as is evident in natural things, for example, heat and cold), and the law forbidding coveting, as a kind of proximate contrary to the part of the soul that covets, is presented to the coveting soul as a contrary to

CHAPTER SEVEN

its freedom, and thereby it takes occasion to rush against the precept; and so it strives toward the concupiscence forbidden by the commandment. Here you can see that the coveting soul does not use the commandment as an instrument or means for coveting, but takes an occasion for coveting, as if defending a freedom to which the commandment is contrary. And so that it need not be repeated, let this be said once for all.

¶ “Worked in me all concupiscence,” that is, every kind of concupiscence; for concupiscence has many parts. Hence in Exodus it is said: you shall not covet your neighbor’s wife, nor ox, nor ass, nor maidservant, and so on. And he speaks of actual concupiscence: for the soul striving for freedom is restrained by no one from concupiscence; but sometimes, bearing it ill to be restrained by the commandment, it begins to covet what before it did not covet. “For without the law.” The conjunction “for” compels me to interpret St. Paul’s words as the reason of what has been said, namely, that sin took occasion through the commandment to work concupiscence. And therefore matters that must be taken up again occur more deeply; for St. Paul introduces in these words two lives and two deaths: the life of sin, my life, the death of sin, and my death. And thus he sets my life and the life of sin as contraries; and so orders it that my life is the death of sin, and the life of sin is my death. For these clearly shine forth in the text.

¶ He therefore gives the reason for what he said about the law of Moses from what was done at the beginning of the human race. For when God created the first parents, before he gave the commandment not to eat the fruit of that forbidden tree, man lived without law, and sin was dead. That man then lived the life of good order and without law is clear from the fact that the discourse concerns his state before the precept was made to him. That sin then was dead is evident because that lower part of the soul which is the cause of sin in us, and therefore is called “sin,” was dead with respect to this, that it did not go forth into the act of sin: for it was, as it were, lulled to sleep by the gift of original justice in which man was created. Therefore from the first state of man, by an argument from the greater, he proves what he intends, saying: “For without the law,” that

TO THE ROMANS

is, before any positive commandment. “Sin,” that is, the lower part of the soul insofar as it is for sinning, “was dead,” that is, as if dead, lulled to sleep by original justice.

¶ “But I.” He speaks in the person of the human race. “Was alive”: with the life of spirit and body without necessity of dying, a life contrary to the life of sin. “Without the law once”: in that primeval state without a positive law even given by God. “But when the commandment came”—“On whatever day you eat of that tree, you shall die the death”—for this was the law or commandment of a positive law, though divine. “Sin revived”: the lulled part of the soul for sinning revived. Nor does he say “revived” because it had previously lived by sinning; but because he had described sin as dead, and nothing dies except what lives, he had to say that it revived. For for what is dead to live is to revive. And it is said to “revive” in the same way it is said to have been “dead,” by privation of the actual life of sin—not which it had had, but which it would have had. For unless the gift of original justice had been present, man’s sensuality would have gone forth into the act of sinning, which is the actual life of sin. By privation of this it is said that sin was dead; and by acquisition of it it is now said that it revived. For concupiscence lived in man when the name of the precept was heard: “Why did God command you...?” and so forth. “But I died,” that is, “I became dead.” For the life of sin was my death: for the life of sin was actual sinning, which was the death both of soul and of body, because the soul died spiritually and the body incurred the necessity of dying.

¶ “And the commandment was found to me”—divine—“which was unto life,” given by God for the life of soul and body, “to be unto death,” for the death of soul and body. And the manner by which that which was unto life was turned into death is added, so that what has been said may be directly applied to the proposed matter. “For sin”—that is, the lower part of the soul, cause of sin—“taking occasion through the commandment,” in the way explained above, “deceived me.” Literally, man was deceived by the occasion taken from the precept: for from there the deception began, from where the opposition to freedom began more

CHAPTER SEVEN

openly, namely, “Why did God command you...?” And man indeed was deceived in the woman, and was led away from the straight path in Adam; and this leading away the expression “deceived” properly signifies. “And through it killed me.” Literally, the lower part of the soul inflicted the death of soul and body, through the commandment to be excluded, as if contrary to its freedom. Nor is this opposed by the fact that the woman said, “The serpent deceived me,” because the internal cause of deception was sin, that is, the lower part of the soul desiring delight; but the devil is the extrinsic cause.

¶ “Therefore.” Once he has made clear what he intends (that on the occasion taken, the lower part of the soul turned the commandment forbidding sin toward sinning), he concludes his response to the question: that the law is not only not sin, but is holy. “The law indeed is holy.” Concerning the whole law of Moses he says it is holy, because it makes men devoted to God. “And the commandment is holy.” In particular he describes the genera of precepts of the law, beginning from the ceremonial, saying the commandment is holy, signifying a relation to God that is pure. “And just”: as to the judicial precepts. “And good”: as to the moral precepts.

¶ “Was that which is good, then, made death to me?” The first question had been about the evil of guilt, asking, “What then shall we say? Is the law sin?” This second question about the law is about the evil of punishment, for death, both of soul and body, is an evil of punishment. He says “that which is good” both so that we may understand this question especially of the moral precepts (which are chiefly good in themselves, and thus farthest removed from producing evil), and because the very notion of good is opposed to producing evil. And the reason for the inquiry is what was said above: “through the commandment it killed me.” Therefore, lest anyone understand the commandment of the law to have been turned into an instrument of killing, he raises this question. “Far be it.” It is abominable.

¶ “But sin, so that sin might appear as sin, worked death for me through what is good.” Between a soul that desires forbidden things and a

TO THE ROMANS

soul that desires those things not forbidden, this difference is found: the soul not forbidden desires by simple appetite; but the soul forbidden desires the forbidden not by simple appetite, but so that its freedom may appear, so that its power may appear, so that what it is may appear. For it contends, as it were, for its own glory against the commandment that restricts its freedom. And this is what St. Paul says: “but sin, so that it might appear as sin,” that is, that part of the soul prone to sinning, so that it might appear what it is, so that it might show itself free, “through what is good,” that is, through the commandment, however good, to be repelled as contrary to its freedom, “worked death for me.” In this it appears that what is good was not turned into death for me; but the inclination to sin, so that it might appear in its freedom, rises up to exclude the good, and so works death for me. Note here that to bring about death for me is common to the inclination to sin both without a commandment and with a commandment; but St. Paul’s purpose was to declare the manner when the commandment concurs—namely, that not the commandment itself, but the lust for sinning brings about death.

¶ “So that sin might become beyond measure sinful through the commandment.” The word translated “sinful” is not a participle but an adjective, which the Latin tongue lacks. In its place some coin “sinful,” others translate “more wickedly.” In the Greek it sounds as if one said “weak weakness,” so that just as one might say “so that weakness might become beyond measure weak through the commandment,” so it is said “so that sin might become beyond measure,” that is, excessively, having sin on the occasion of the commandment. And by this the proper effect of the occasion taken from the commandment is described and declared: namely, not simply to sin, but to sin excessively—manifesting what he had proposed: “the law came in so that sin might abound.”

¶ “For we know.” The conjunction “for” is referred to the giving of the reason for both: namely, that the law is good, and that sin (that is, the lower part of the soul prone to sinning) is what deceives and kills. And when he says “we know,” he says it in the person of the wise. “That the law is spiritual.” The law of Moses is called spiritual because it regulates the

CHAPTER SEVEN

spirit, that is, the higher part of man; for to this the moral precepts of the law tend. “But I am carnal.” Against the spirituality of the law, in contrast he distinguishes himself as carnal, so that we may understand that just as the law tends to what is spirit, so I tend to what is flesh. And lest there be a question in what sense St. Paul uses “I” when he says, “But I am carnal,” he adds: “Sold under sin,” that we may understand that he uses “I” from that side by which he is sold under sin, that is, by which he is a servant of sin. Therefore the sense is that I, according to the lower part of the soul, am carnal and tend toward the things of the flesh. For according to this part of the soul, whether he wills it or not, man is a servant of sin—even the most just man—and according to it there is the tinder of sin.

¶ He says “sold” so that we may understand that man was not created in the servitude of sin, but has been sold into the servitude of sin. By whom he was sold he does not explain, because it is clear that man sold himself at a most vile price, by desire of delight, in the first parents. For whoever does sin thereby constitutes himself a servant of sin; this is to be sold under sin, with reference to the “price,” namely the desire of delight or utility for which man sins.

¶ “For what I do, I do not understand.” About to prove in detail the three things premised, he sets down as a foundation for all the conditions of the just man that he is not simple but composite from two principles—mind and flesh, spirit and sin, that is, tinder. With respect to this, the conjunction “for” signifies that the foundation of all is brought forward, in two conditions testifying that man is, as it were, two: namely, that he acts without understanding, and that there is disobedience and contrariety of deed to will. For by saying “for what I do I do not understand,” he reveals that he acts without the command of intellect; and by saying “for I do not do the good that I will,” he describes himself as disobedient to himself willing; and by saying “but the evil that I hate, that I do,” he testifies that he is contrary to himself hating and willing. St. Paul wisely teaches the internal principles from the acts: and from the fact that man does many things without understanding and without and

TO THE ROMANS

even against volitions, he shows that man consists of principles warring against each other.

¶ And nevertheless St. Paul uses this same part of the text to prove that clause, “but I am carnal”; for he proves this from the fact that he acts without understanding. For the operation of a rational man insofar as he is rational is an operation through intellect; and therefore from the very fact that I do not understand what I do—from the very fact that I act without the command of intellect—I experience myself to be carnal. Nor is there need of proof that we act without the command of intellect, because we experience in ourselves many appetites of the soul and many thoughts coming forth without the command of intellect, from the soul’s inclinations toward its own delights: for this is what it is to be carnal.

¶ Yet St. Paul proves it, adding: “For I do not do the good that I will.” The good is left over. He makes clear that he acts without understanding from the fact that he does not act according to will; for intellect commands through will as a medium. “But the evil that I hate, that I do.” The evil is left over. From each act (namely willing and not willing) he makes clear what we experience daily in ourselves, while sensuality both does not do what we will and does what we will not, by various appetites.

¶ “But if I do what I will not.” From this last statement (that is, from the contrariety of deed to willing), after he has proved himself carnal, he proves that the law is spiritual. And know that the force of the middle term consists in the contrariety of will to deed; but he proceeds from the side of the will in what is said, “if I do what I will not.” For from the fact that I will not what I do according to the flesh, it manifestly follows that my will agrees with the law, which also forbids what I, being carnal, do. And therefore it is most fittingly inferred: “I consent to the law, that it is good.”

¶ Note the art of the progress. He does not say “my will consents,” but “I consent.” For after he has distinguished himself into contraries (namely himself understanding and willing, and himself doing), he intends to place himself simply and absolutely in the place of himself

CHAPTER SEVEN

understanding and willing, and to exclude himself simply and absolutely from the place of himself doing, attributing that place not to himself but to the sin dwelling in the flesh. Thus, whereas up to this point, as if conflating himself, he used “I” on both sides, now distinguishing, ordering, and resolving into proper principles, he uses “I” according to what he is and not according to that by which he is diseased—which is not a being but a privation, not a substance but a disease, that is, sin. And therefore he says, “I consent,” I simply and absolutely.

¶ Here also note another no less artful point: whereas above he had placed himself against the law, saying, “the law is spiritual, but I am carnal,” now he places himself on the side of the law, saying, “I consent to the law that it is good.” For simply and absolutely, man according to what he is consents to the law and testifies that the law is good, since he wills the contrary of what the infected flesh does; for just as that willing is good, so the law having the same willing is good. Thus from the innermost recesses of the mind and will we bear witness that the law is good.

¶ “But now it is no longer I who do it.” Once he has proved that the law is good, where he placed himself on the side of the law, lest you also place him absolutely on the side of the flesh, he separates himself absolutely from the place or part of the flesh, that is, from the place of his doing. By saying “but now,” he signifies the time of the justified man; and the pronoun “I” shows himself not according to a part (as above he showed when he said, “I am carnal”), but simply and absolutely, according to what he is; and therefore he truly says that it is not I who do that involuntary thing. “But sin that dwells in me.” Behold the one doing the work without intellect and will: I am not the cause of the involuntary work, but sin dwelling in me.

¶ It is called “sin dwelling” because the inclination of the lower part of the soul toward sin is called sin—and is—because it is part of original sin, which remains even in the baptized and in just and holy men. And although it is natural insofar as the sensitive nature naturally tends toward sensible good (which frequently is contrary to rational good), it is

TO THE ROMANS

nevertheless part of original sin insofar as it is deprived of the bridle of original justice. For from this voluntary privation, by the will of the first parent, it has the notion of sin; and it remains in the baptized and the just under the notion of an implanted effect and penalty of original sin, just as being mortal also remains. Nor does it cease to be called sin, either because it is the cause of sin, or rather because it is from sin: just as a letter written by my hand, by customary speech, is called “my hand,” with everyone saying of the handwriting, “that is his hand.” And it is called “dwelling” because this deprivation remains and perseveres in us continuously, not as a guest but as an inhabitant.

¶ “For I know”—with certain knowledge and by experience—he proves what he had said immediately before, namely, that sin dwelling in me does the involuntary thing. “That nothing good dwells in me (that is, in my flesh).” From the fact that the good of grace dwelling in the spirit does not dwell in the flesh, he proves that sin dwelling in the flesh does such involuntary things. For the good of divine grace through baptism dwells in the higher part of man, but not in the lower part of the soul that is called “flesh.” And therefore he most truly says that he knows and experiences that in himself, that is, in his flesh, the good of grace does not dwell. Here you clearly see that he explains “I am carnal” by casting it back into the flesh and excluding from himself absolutely that he is carnal. And from the fact that the good of divine grace does not reform the flesh as it reforms the mind, the flesh remains disordered, the tinder of sin remains.

¶ “For to will is present with me.” He proves this last statement (that the good does not dwell in my flesh but in my mind) from the fact that to will is present with me, that is, the power of willing good is in me as justified. “But to accomplish good I do not find,” that is, I do not find the power of carrying out the good, which belongs to the lower part. For this is what Christ said in other words: “The spirit indeed is ready, but the flesh is weak.” And that this is true he proves from actions, using the things said above: “For I do not do the good that I will; but the evil that I will not, that I do.” Above he had explained this disobedience and

CHAPTER SEVEN

contrariety without mentioning good and evil; now he applies disobedience to the good and contrariety to the evil, because from these it is evident that although willing good and not willing evil are in my power, nevertheless I do not find accomplishing good and avoiding evil in the flesh that executes, that is, in the lower part of the soul. For it is found disobedient when I will good, and contrary—doing evil—when I will not evil.

¶ “But if I do what I will not.” Taking up again what he last said, he argues to conclude that it is not I but the sin dwelling in me that does the involuntary evil. And most fittingly from the contrariety of deed to not-willing he infers: “It is now no longer I who do it, but the sin that dwells in me.” From the fact that I will not some evil, it follows that I do not do it; but from the fact that I do that evil, that is, I execute it according to the lower part, it follows that the sin dwelling in me does that evil.

¶ Recall here that from this very proposition, from this very contrariety (signified by saying “if I do what I will not”), St. Paul above inferred, “I consent to the law that it is good”; and now he infers that it is not I who do the evil but sin dwelling in me. For this contrariety, from the side of the higher part, implies both agreement with the law and denial of doing the evil; but from the side of the lower part it implies that the sin dwelling in me is what does the evil which I will not.

¶ “I find, therefore, a law for me who wills to do good.” It was not enough from the conditions of the justified man to declare that the law is good; it was also necessary from those same conditions to declare that the law is spiritual, since this was proposed. And therefore now he infers from those same contrary conditions the spirituality together with the necessity of the law. Spirituality, indeed, by inferring: “I find, therefore, a law for me who wills to do good.” For it is now evident from the foregoing that I, willing to do good, am I according to the spirit. And therefore from the very fact that for me who wills to do good I find a law, it appears that the law is spiritual; otherwise I would find the law against me as I will to do good. But I do not find the law against me; rather I find

TO THE ROMANS

it for me who wills to do good, that is, for me spiritual. Therefore the law is spiritual; it is useful to me spiritual.

¶ He adds the necessity by adding: "Because evil is present with me." Therefore I find the law useful to me spiritual because evil is present with me; for the necessity of the law is on the side of the evil present with me. For if the good of grace were in both parts of the justified man, the spiritual man would indeed find the law useful, but not necessary by reason of contrariety within man. But because evil is present even in the justified, the law is found as a bridle, to restrain the inclination to sinning.

¶ "For I delight in the law of God according to the inner man." Giving the reason for each of the last statements, he proceeds to declare what remained, namely, that he was "sold under sin," the two prior things having been declared: "the law is spiritual" and "I am carnal." For that it is true that I find the law for me who wills to do good is clear because I delight in the law of God according to the inner man, that is, according to the mind, according to the spirit. And he called the higher part of the soul the "inner man" because it performs its operations within, in itself, without bodily organs. For intellect and will excel as separated from the whole body. And by the opposite, the "outer man" would be called man according to the sensitive parts, both internal and external, because they are immersed in bodily functions.

¶ "But I see another law in my members." Behold the parts of the outer man, those from which the outer man is composed, namely the carnal members both internal and external. "Resisting the law of my mind." The law of God and the law of my mind agree; for by "the law of my mind" he understands the natural law impressed upon the mind. But the "law in the members" is the very ordering of carnal affections toward delights and utilities according to sense. For such inclination is called a "law" because it is, as it were, a natural law of the sensitive part insofar as it is sensitive. But this law resists the law of the mind, because the inclination of the sensitive part tends toward useful and delightful good according to sense, whereas the inclination of the mind and spirit tends

CHAPTER SEVEN

toward good according to right reason and toward spiritual good. And it is clear that these two goods are often opposed to each other, as experience testifies. And therefore, however justified and holy St. Paul is, he most truly says: “I see another law in my members resisting the law of my mind.”

¶ “And bringing me into captivity in the law of sin which is in my members.” Behold what he had said, “sold under sin.” It is worth considering that just as on the side of the higher soul he mentions two laws (the law of God and the law of my mind), so also on the side of the lower he mentions two laws: the law of my members and the law of sin, so that the law of the flesh is set against the law of the mind, and the law of sin against the law of God. And as the law of the mind subjects man to the law of God, so the law of the flesh subjects man to the law of sin.

¶ And although both the law of the flesh and the law of sin are in my members, as St. Paul clearly says, they nevertheless differ in this: the law of the flesh is natural, the natural inclination of the lower powers toward their proper goods; but the law of sin is the penalty of original sin, and is the disorder of those same powers left behind from the loss of original justice. Therefore the law of the flesh and the law of sin are distinguished not materially, not by subject, but formally and by principles: for the one is from nature, the other from sin; the one is inclination, the other privation. Hence also the one renders me captive under the other, as St. Paul says. And truly: for the natural inclination of the sensitive part toward delightful good according to sense renders me captive under sin.

¶ Examine the manner in which the first parents sinned, and you will see that we sin as they did: whom the natural inclination toward delightful good led into the servitude of sin. And the name “law” fits this penalty of sin because, like a law issuing from sin, it leads to sinning—yet in that manner in which the privation of a bridle leads, namely by permitting or removing what would prohibit. Therefore the sensitive inclination renders the just man captive under the law of sin, while it subjects him unwillingly to evil appetites in the first involuntary motions.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “Unhappy man that I am.” Hence it appears more clearly that he spoke in the person of the justified man: for such a sighing affection, grieving at the state of the flesh, is manifestly an affection not only of the justified but of the holy man, professing himself miserable by reason of carnal affections and sighing for deliverance. Hence he says: “Who will deliver me from the body of this death?” In the Greek text the pronoun “this” is ambiguous as to whether it refers to “body” or to “death,” so that it can be read “from the body of this death,” so that this body is signified to be a body of death; and it can be read “from the body of this death,” signifying that he does not sigh to be delivered from the body absolutely, but from the body of this death, that is, from the body insofar as it ministers this death. For it is in some sense a death to suffer such sensible motions. And the sense is: since the gift of Christ’s grace does not deliver me from this deadly condition of the flesh, who will deliver me from it? as if to say: no one. And he speaks truly for the state of the present life; therefore he says “me,” the justified man of whom he speaks.

¶ “Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Here is signified not God’s grace delivering, but the giving of thanks. Lest, despising the justified state because of the miseries of the flesh, you should understand the words “Unhappy man that I am, who will deliver me?” as spoken in despair, he adds the giving of thanks to God through Jesus, so that from the fact that he gives thanks to God through Jesus Christ we may understand that a benefit is signified by that utterance, and that the voice spoken is a benefit of God conferred through Jesus Christ. And truly it is a great benefit that the justified man not only knows but esteems the flesh he sees in himself to be a misery, and burns with desire for a thing commonly impossible—not simply, but in this life. For such an inflamed wish that the whole man may serve God is meritorious and useful for withdrawing more and more from the servitude of the flesh. Therefore the sense is: although on the side of the flesh I know myself miserable and not to be delivered in this life, nevertheless for this very fact—that I esteem this misery and burn with desire for freedom—I give thanks to God through Jesus Christ, because

CHAPTER SEVEN

this is a benefit conferred upon me from the gift of the grace of Jesus Christ, my mind having been reformed; therefore I give thanks to God through Jesus Christ, because he is the mediator, through whom I have obtained this benefit of mind.

¶ “Therefore I myself, with the mind, serve the law of God; but with the flesh, the law of sin.” This conclusion borders upon what precedes and what follows. For from here St. Paul begins to pass to showing the gift of peace that the justified have toward God through Christ, extended to delivering from the law of sin; and that extension is made through the voluntary use of the law of the spirit. Thus, whereas up to this point he declared that the gift of Christ does not deliver the justified from the flesh, the flesh working motions against our will, beyond understanding, now consequently he intends to teach what the gift of Christ effects in the flesh in the justified, when the voluntary use of that gift intervenes. And therefore from what has been said he infers the actions and fruits of both inclinations: saying that from what has been said it follows that in me, the justified man, there are two principles inclining to contraries—the mind and the flesh—and thus I, justified, with the mind am inclined to serve voluntarily the law of God, but with the flesh I am inclined to serve voluntarily the law of sin; and both are clear. And I would believe that this clause is more suitably joined and made the beginning of the following chapter than the end of the preceding, because it begins the matter of what follows.

TO THE ROMANS

CHAPTER VIII

¶ “Therefore now there is no condemnation.” Since in the preceding remarks St. Paul had taught that those who are justified through the gift of Christ are not without the evil of the flesh warring against the spirit—lest you should think the gift of Christ imperfect, as was the gift of the ancient Law (since among those justified in Christ and those who follow the righteousness of the divine Law given through Moses it is common that the mind serves the law of God, but the flesh the law of sin; it is common to have flesh and spirit fighting against one another)—therefore he adds the difference between those justified in Christ who walk according to the spirit and those who pursue the law of God who walk according to the law. And the difference consists in this: that in the former nothing condemnably is committed, by reason of the gift of Christ, both external and internal; in the latter many condemnably things are committed, by reason of the impotence of the Law while the flesh remains vigorous, namely because the Law does not confer grace and does not condemn sin in the flesh. He says, then, “no condemnation” in this sense: no act by which we deserve to be condemned, as is clear from the fact that this is not said of those who are in Jesus Christ, but of those who walk in Jesus Christ according to the spirit—which clearly denotes the exercise of our works. And he said this to distinguish it from the first movements, which are also present in those justified in Christ, so that we may understand that these are not matter for condemnation, and so that we may understand that they are not opposed to those who are exempt from every merit of condemnation. For the first movements do not render holy men condemnably, both because of their imperfection and because they are swallowed up by the abundance of continuous holy actions. And he says “now” so that we may understand that he is speaking of the state of the present life, lest you should suppose that, by reason of

CHAPTER EIGHT

the state of future blessedness, he excludes every condemnation from these.

¶ “To those who are.” The word “are” is superfluous.

¶ “In Christ Jesus who.” The word “who” is superfluous.

¶ “Who do not walk according to the flesh.” Three words are lacking.

¶ “But according to the spirit.” In St. Paul’s text there is one single clause, but the interpreter divided it into two. For St. Paul has: “to those who are in Christ Jesus, who do not walk according to the flesh but according to the spirit,” although in sense there is no difference.

¶ Lest you should understand exemption from every condemnation as common to all who are justified in Christ, he explained to whom it belongs, so that we may understand that this exemption is not preserved with just any works, but with continuous progress—not according to carnal affections, but according to the inclination of the spirit—and this in Christ Jesus. And he said “in Christ Jesus” to distinguish them from followers of the divine Law before the age of Jesus. And he says “walk,” so that he may signify not a mere state but a progress of a right life, with negligence and sloth excluded, to distinguish them from those Christians who, although exempt from every condemnation, take little care to keep themselves so. He also adds the negation of carnal works to refute heretics who “walk according to the spirit” and at the same time according to the flesh, while they accomplish carnal works under the pretext of the spirit. And he adds to the negation of carnal works the works “according to the spirit,” to rouse the sluggish to whom it seems a great thing that they abstain from pursuing carnal things, so that they may understand that it is not sufficient, in order to avoid every condemnation, to abstain from carnal things, but that one must advance in spiritual things.

¶ “For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus.” This is the fifth law among those named here by St. Paul. For after the four previously named (namely, the law of God, the law of my mind, the law of the members or of the flesh, and the law of sin), there is now added the law of

TO THE ROMANS

the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. And the order is as follows: the law of the spirit—not of any spirit whatsoever, but of the spirit of life, that is, the vital spirit, the life-giving spirit, the spirit carrying life with itself; and of life not natural, but of life in Christ Jesus, the life by which we live in faith, hope, love, and imitation of Jesus Christ. And he added this to distinguish it from the law of God through Moses, which he had called a “spiritual law,” as if he had said more plainly: although each is a law of the spirit, yet this of which I speak is the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, whereas that is not. Each is of the Holy Spirit as author; each is directive of our spirit; but this is of the Holy Spirit insofar as He is our life-giver in Jesus Christ, insofar as by dwelling in us He gives us life in Jesus Christ. And this law is the ordering, disposition, and lordship of the Holy Spirit in us, proceeding from the Holy Spirit giving us life in faith, hope, and love of Jesus Christ. Of this ordering indeed what follows is true. Here, learned reader, see how aptly he proves that nothing condemnable is committed by those who walk in Christ according to the spirit, from the efficacy of the law of the life-giving Spirit in Jesus Christ.

¶ “Has freed me from the law of sin.” The pronoun “me” shows that he is speaking as one who walks in Christ not according to the flesh but according to the spirit; for he introduces the person of such men. He does not say, “has freed me from this body of death,” about which above he had sighed, “Who will free me from this body of death?” For from the body of this death no one is freed in the present life; but from the law of sin all who are baptized and who walk according to the spirit are freed, insofar as they are absolved from the dominion of sin over them, from the obligation of conforming their voluntary operations to the law of sin. The Law did not absolve from this bond. For the Holy Spirit, giving us life in Jesus Christ, so orders our souls inwardly that, supported by such help, we do not follow the law of sin; but followers of the Law, because they lack this gift and are left to themselves, as though subject to sin, are almost compelled to conform their voluntary works to the law of sin.

¶ “And of death.” He does not say “has freed from death,” but “from the law of death,” which law, as St. Paul himself explains below,

CHAPTER EIGHT

consists in remaining in death. For the law of death—the law following death—is to persevere dead, to remain dead; it is not to return from death to life. And from this law we have been freed through the Holy Spirit dwelling in us, as is plain below.

¶ “For what was impossible for the law.” In this matter concerning those who walk according to the spirit in Christ Jesus, St. Paul has proposed many things in his own manner; and therefore, intending in his own manner to declare each thing proposed, he begins from the first, namely: “there is no condemnation for those who walk in Christ,” and he directly proves that it is by Christ’s effect that we incur nothing condemnable—something the law of Moses could not accomplish. And so that these matters may be understood more clearly, two things subordinate to the main point are to be noted, which the Law could not accomplish: one is the lordship of the spirit over the flesh; the other, consequent on this, is the perfect execution of the precepts of the Law. The reason why the Law could do neither of these is added.

¶ “In that it was weak through the flesh.” That is, in that it was powerless by reason of the carnal condition. For the law of Moses, although it was spiritual (that is, given by God to regulate man’s spirit), nevertheless, because it did not help inwardly through grace, the Law was weak and feeble by reason of the carnal condition of men in which it left them. From this feebleness of the Law it clearly follows that the Law could not accomplish those two things we have explained.

¶ “God, sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh.” The word rendered “sending” is a participle of past active tense, which the Latin language lacks; and therefore, to preserve both participle and tense, some interpreters have rendered (and rightly) the active as a passive, reading thus: “God, with His Son having been sent in the likeness of sinful flesh.” He does not say “in the likeness of flesh,” because He was sent in true flesh and not in the likeness of flesh; but he determines the quality of the flesh of which he speaks by adding “of sin,” because He was sent not in true sinful flesh, that is, flesh subject to sin, but in the likeness of flesh that is subject to sin. For our flesh is “sinful flesh” after Adam sinned; but

TO THE ROMANS

the Son of God was sent in flesh like our flesh subject to sin, insofar as He was sent in passible and mortal flesh. For by these conditions Christ's flesh in this life was like sinful flesh. For flesh that is subject to sin is subject to sufferings and death, as is clear at the beginning of Genesis.

¶ “And concerning sin He condemned sin in the flesh, that the justification of the law might be fulfilled in us.” Observe first that neither in the Greek nor in the Latin does the order of the letter appear complete unless one understands some conjunction, such as “and” or “also,” or some equivalent conjunction. With the conjunction supplied, we understand that another benefit follows: namely, that we may note that God not only sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, but also, concerning sin, condemned sin in the flesh. And nevertheless the sense remains obscure. But it becomes clear by penetrating the proper causes of things and by resolving effects into their proper causes (as befits a doctor). For because he had said that the Law was feeble through the flesh for fulfilling the justification, which is fulfilled in those who walk in Christ, he now asserts, on Christ's side, an efficacy over the flesh, so that the justification of the Law may be fulfilled in us who walk in Him, and so forth. And although St. Paul could have shown this efficacy by many means, he chose this way, because here the proper cause of our flesh being subdued by God through Christ is explained—not the way of power, but of justice.

¶ In this very fact, therefore, that the Son of God had in this life flesh like sinful flesh, it is clear that the Son of God was clothed with sin, or assumed the person of one who has sin, much more than one who puts on the garments and mask of Caesar assumes the person of Caesar—so much more as flesh subject to sufferings and death is the most common sign of a man who has sin; and in nothing is this deceptive except in Christ. Hence when it is said “concerning sin,” sin is signified not as existing in Him, but as assumed. For the sense is “concerning assumed sin.” For Christ never had any sin in Himself, but He assumed sin by taking on the likeness of sinful flesh.

CHAPTER EIGHT

¶ And just as, by giving each to each, Christ by His death destroyed our death, and by His immortal life restored our life, so by assumed sin—through the likeness of sinful flesh—He condemned sin in the flesh. For this is to resolve the effect into its proper causes. And from this you have why St. Paul mentioned “sent in the likeness of sinful flesh”: both to explain the manner in which Christ assumed sin, and to explain that the innocent flesh of Christ condemned sin in our flesh. For sin in our flesh is most fittingly condemned by the merit of innocent flesh clothed with assumed sin, just as death is condemned by death. For he intends that, as Christ by His death merited the destruction of our death, so in this, that He voluntarily assumed sin in flesh like sinful flesh, He merited the condemnation of sin in our flesh.

¶ Nor did merit alone intervene, with the consequence of His having assumed flesh (for the flesh was assumed first, and then the merit was His voluntary endurance of the assumed clothing of sin in Christ already made man), but a condemning action also intervened, just as, in dying, not only did merit intervene, but the divine action destroying death. For this reason St. Paul attributes the action of condemning not to Christ, but to God, through Christ’s flesh clothed with assumed sin; for he says that God, with His Son sent and so forth, “condemned sin in the flesh,” so that we may understand a divine action inflicting condemnation on sin in our flesh, both by reason of such flesh of His Son and by reason of the merit of assumed sin.

¶ Nor did he say “extinguished,” but “condemned” sin in the flesh, because he speaks with respect to us who walk by the spirit and so forth. For in our flesh, while we are here, sin is not utterly extinguished through Christ (for the tinder of sin remains), but it is condemned: it is adjudged to condemnation. For to condemn is judicially to assign to punishment; and sin in our flesh (that is, in all the baptized) is, by the justice of the innocent flesh of Christ under the injury of assumed sin, condemned, assigned to extinction. But extinction is not perfected in this life; it is enough that in the meantime it is subjected and affected by the

TO THE ROMANS

punishment of diminution to such an extent and in such a manner that the justification of the law may be fulfilled in us who walk.

¶ And he does not say “that justification might be fulfilled in us,” but “that the justification of the law” might be fulfilled—without doubt, of the Mosaic Law—so that we may understand that he is speaking of justification, that is, the perfect execution of the Law, which the Law could not complete, because sin in the flesh remained uncondemned and vigorous. And that he speaks of this justification is clear from the fact that he adds that this justification is not fulfilled in all the baptized, but in those who walk according to the spirit.

¶ Hence two things are obtained: first, of what justification he speaks—namely, that which is proper to those who walk in Christ according to the spirit—which is to fulfill the precepts of the Law perfectly, without doubt as to the moral precepts; second, the mode by which the condemnation of sin accomplished through Christ attains this effect and is brought to this end, which is that the justification of the Law be fulfilled in us. For from this it is had that the mode is that, by means of the law of the spirit, there is walking. Thus, because sin in our flesh has been condemned by Christ’s merit, inasmuch as it has been assigned to the condemnation of extinction and the tinder of sin has been subjected, it comes about that in those who walk according to the spirit the justification of the Law is fulfilled—something that clearly happens through the gift of internal grace possessed through Christ.

¶ Thus two gifts of Christ are signified as concurring: one on the side of the flesh, which he chiefly intends in this reasoning, namely, that by assumed sin in flesh like sinful flesh, sin in our flesh was condemned; the other on the side of the spirit, as the mode by which the gift on the side of the flesh is brought to such an effect, which is the full justification of the Law.

¶ Therefore, with the matter explained, gather the sense. St. Paul makes clear that those who walk in Christ according to the spirit commit nothing condemnable, just as those who walked according to the spirit in the Law committed something condemnable, because the full fulfillment

CHAPTER EIGHT

of the Law, which the Law could not accomplish on account of the carnal state, is accomplished in those who walk in Christ according to the spirit. And this is accomplished in this way: because the carnal state, which the Law could not remove, God removed in us by sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh; and thus, concerning assumed sin, He condemned sin in the flesh—that is, by justice, He assigned it to the condemnation of extinction and affected it with the punishment of diminution—sin in our flesh, which made the state carnal, so that the justification of the Law might be fulfilled in us. That is, so that we might have, even from the side of the flesh, less impediment for fulfilling the justifications of the Law, and thus we would leave no place for condemnation in ourselves, although first movements arise.

¶ “Who do not walk according to the flesh, but according to the spirit.” He explains whom the pronoun “us” indicates, so that he may explicitly conclude what he had proposed.

¶ “For those who are according to the flesh.” He declares the difference between those who walk according to the flesh and those who walk according to the spirit, so that by explaining the terms he uses, he may give clarity. Hence, when it is said “those who are according to the flesh,” and similarly when it is added “those who are according to the spirit,” the discourse is not about substantial being, but about moral being. For the sense is: those who have a mind disposed according to the flesh; and likewise those who have a mind disposed according to the spirit.

¶ “Savor the things of the flesh.” The word rendered “savor,” from which the verbal noun is derived that below is rendered now “wisdom,” now “prudence,” properly signifies something under the genus of cognition, to which no Latin word appears to correspond. And because it is used to signify an adjunct affection of the mind, no nearer rendering occurs than “care” and “to care,” so that the sense is: “they care for the things that are of the flesh.” And similarly, when it is added “but those who are of the spirit perceive the things that are of the spirit,” it must be supplied “they perceive,” because in the Greek text no verb is present but

TO THE ROMANS

the same verb is understood. For care is an act of the intellect joined to an affection of the mind. And the difference is most true: those disposed in mind according to the flesh are occupied with cares regarding the flesh, namely, the useful and the pleasant; but those disposed in mind according to the spirit are occupied with cares regarding the spirit, namely, what is honorable, useful, and pleasant with respect to the spirit.

¶ “But those who are according to the spirit perceive the things of the spirit.”

¶ “For the prudence of the flesh is death.” That is, it brings death upon the soul and eternal condemnation. Know that the name “prudence” is close to the Greek word previously mentioned and accords with the intended sense, for it pertains to the intellect insofar as it is moved by affection toward an end. Hence the prudence of the flesh is the reasoning of a man affected toward the flesh as his end. For he who has the flesh as his end thinks, reasons, deliberates, judges, and commands with reference to the flesh. And proportionally the same holds for the prudence of the spirit.

¶ “But the prudence of the spirit is life and peace.” He gives the reason for the fittingness of the action. For from the fact that care or prudence of the flesh is death-dealing, it follows that it suits those disposed carnally in mind; for the flesh itself is death-dealing. And similarly, from the fact that care or prudence of the spirit brings life of soul and peace of soul, it follows that it suits those who have a spiritual mind, for the spirit itself is the parent of life and peace.

¶ “Because the wisdom”—that is, the care or prudence—“of the flesh is an enemy of God”—that is, it is enmity against God. So that we may understand that care of the flesh is not an act of nature that can be done well or badly, but is a sin that cannot be done well, he said that it is enmity against God.

¶ “For it is not subject to the law of God.” Behold the manifest reason for enmity. He does not say that it is not subject to God (since even sins are subject to God’s power), but he denies that it is subject to

CHAPTER EIGHT

the law of God, as being unable to receive the form of the Law. Nor indeed can it.

¶ “For neither can it be.” Lest you should think that sometimes it could be subjected to the law of God, he excludes that as possible. For it is incompatible that the whole form of the Law and sin should be together.

¶ “But those who are in the flesh.” He adds that those who have the prudence of the flesh are carnal in mind, so that he might make clear that not only the care of the flesh, but also the carnal themselves are enemies of God.

¶ “Cannot please God.” This is not to be understood as it is of the care of the flesh, but it is to be understood formally, that is, insofar as they are in such a carnal state of mind. Thus they cannot please God. Yet it stands with this that, through divine grace, they can be changed from being according to the flesh—that is, from a carnal disposition of mind—and thus can please God.

¶ “But you are not in the flesh, but in the spirit.” Hence it is clear that St. Paul is not speaking of being in the flesh according to substance; for it is certain that the Romans to whom he wrote were then in the flesh according to substance, and yet he says to them: “but you are not in the flesh,” that is, you are not carnal in mind but spiritual. And for the same reason he says “you,” where up to this point he had said “we,” saying “that it might be fulfilled in us who do not walk according to the flesh,” and so forth. For by speaking now in the first person and now in the second, he signifies that this disposition is common also to others, not only to Apostles. Yet perhaps he said this deliberately so that the Romans might understand from themselves who and what sort of persons are those whom he called “according to the spirit,” lest they suppose that something else lies hidden under this title.

¶ “If indeed.” After St. Paul declared two of those things he proposed at the beginning of the chapter (namely, “there is no condemnation,” and “those who walk according to the spirit, not according to the flesh”), he now declares the third, namely, “the law of the

TO THE ROMANS

spirit of life in Christ Jesus.” He declares it while also giving the reason why the Romans themselves are in the spirit and not in the flesh. And he gives the reason under a condition, saying “if indeed,” so that the Romans may understand that, to be not in the flesh but in the spirit, it is not enough to have been baptized (as all of them were), but it is required that the Holy Spirit remain. And therefore he uses the verb of the present tense and the word of indwelling, adding:

¶ “The Spirit of God dwells in you.” By saying “the Spirit of God,” he makes clear that when he said “the law of the spirit,” his discourse was about the Spirit of God dwelling, not merely lodging, in the souls of men. And therefore he says “dwells.” For unless He rests in the soul as a dweller, He does not produce an efficacious law in a man; and thus the law of the spirit has no place.

¶ “But if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not His.” The phrase “the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus” was to be explained not only with respect to “spirit,” but also with respect to “life in Christ Jesus.” Therefore, for its explanation he adds that life in Christ Jesus is by having the Spirit of Christ, so that we may understand that the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ are the same, and that one does not have the Spirit of God unless one has the Spirit of Christ—that is, that the Spirit of God never dwells in us unless He joins us to Christ. Hence the pronoun “His” indicates the Spirit of God. For the sense is: if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not the Spirit of God’s, that is, he is not a temple in which the Spirit of God dwells. And according to this sense it is directly had that the Holy Spirit dwelling in men is the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, because He is the Spirit of Christ in us; and thus He joins men to Christ, without doubt in soul—by believing, hoping, loving, imitating, and so forth. He is said to be and is the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of God because He is God from God, and He inspires, moves, and impels us to God while dwelling in us; and He is the Spirit of Christ because He is also from Christ by reason of the divine nature, and because by Christ’s merit He has been given to us, and because He inspires, moves, and impels to Christ those in whom He dwells.

CHAPTER EIGHT

¶ “But if Christ is in you.” He declares the other thing proposed (namely, “has freed me from the law of sin”) while continuing senses that follow one another. And for the same reason he uses “Christ is in you” and “the Spirit of Christ is in you,” because the discourse is about being in the mind, in which it is the same to have Christ and to have the Spirit of Christ. For Christ dwells in the mind by the same faith, hope, and charity, and likewise the Holy Spirit, who is of God and of Christ, dwells in us by the same faith, hope, and charity.

¶ “The body indeed is dead because of sin.” St. Paul, aiming at brevity, describes us as like Christ by Christ dwelling in us: that just as Christ had a mortal body and a living spirit, so our body is dead, that is, mortal, while the spirit is living. But the dissimilarity is in the cause: for our body is dead because of its own sin. For original sin is the common sin of all men except Christ.

¶ “But the spirit lives because of justification”—that is, because of justice. Here too there is a dissimilarity in the cause: because the life of the spirit of Christ does not depend on justice, but from the beginning was blessed; but the life of the spirit of those in whom Christ dwells is because of the justice of Christ, by which He satisfied God by paying the price of human redemption. For because of that justice, both extrinsically and by participation of it intrinsically, there is life in those in whom Christ dwells. And this is that such are freed from the law of sin, as was explained above. But for the letter, note that “spirit” is the nominative when it is said, “but the spirit is life,” and “is” is understood. And it is verified of our spirit in act, that is, actually operating: for our spirit believing, hoping, loving, and being prudent is the life of grace, because of the justice of Christ participated by Christ’s dwelling in us.

¶ “But if the Spirit of Him.” He declares the last phrase proposed (namely, “has freed me from the law of death”), while nevertheless continuing senses that follow one another. Here recall that at the beginning of chapter five four goods were proposed that the justified by faith in Jesus have; and note that of those four, the first (namely, that we have peace with God) St. Paul has explained from that place up to this

TO THE ROMANS

point, showing that through the gift of Christ we have been freed from original sin, from the abundance of actual sin, from the servitude of the Mosaic Law, and from the law of sin. But now he intends to explain the remaining three (namely, that we glory in hope of the glory of God, that we glory in tribulations, and that we glory in God), while also continuing and explaining how the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has freed us from the law of death. For he intends to make clear that through the Spirit of God and of Christ dwelling in us we attain these three. The first of these coincides with liberation from the law of death. And therefore at the same time he declares both that the law of the spirit dwelling in us has freed us from the law of death, and that it grants us to glory in hope of the glory of God. For immortal life prepared for us after the resurrection is liberation from the law of death, and it is the glory of God in whose hope we glory. Hence he begins from the Spirit of God, saying:

¶ “If the Spirit of Him”—without doubt, of God—“who raised Jesus from the dead.” Jesus, insofar as He is man, was raised by God; but insofar as He is God, He raised Himself.

¶ “Dwells in you.” All this is the antecedent of a conditional proposition, whose consequent he adds.

¶ “He who raised Christ Jesus from the dead.” The relative “He” refers to God. And the sense is: God who raised Jesus Christ from the dead.

¶ “Will give life also to your mortal bodies, because of His Spirit dwelling in you.” According to the two things assumed in the antecedent (namely, the dwelling of the Spirit of God in us, and the raising of Jesus Christ from the dead), he likewise infers two things in the consequent, namely the giving of life to our mortal bodies, and this from the raising of Jesus Christ; and the cause of our justification, and this from the Spirit of God dwelling in us. For he gives the reason for our future immortality from the concomitance of the body’s quality with the spirit’s quality, from a quasi-natural sequence of gifts in the body corresponding to gifts of the spirit—of the life of the body corresponding to the life of the spirit. Thus, because the Spirit of God who raised JESUS (that is, the

CHAPTER EIGHT

Spirit who is both given by God through the raising of Jesus, and who breathes and impels to God not in just any manner but insofar as God raised Christ Jesus from the dead) dwells in you, therefore it must follow that that same God who raised Jesus, because of the dignity of the said Spirit dwelling in you, will in due time give life to your mortal bodies. For thus gifts of the body will correspond to gifts of the spirit; thus the resurrection of Christ, communicated first in us by faith, hope, and charity through the Holy Spirit dwelling in us, will later be communicated in the body; thus finally we, who while placed in the flesh have obtained so great a dignity that we have had the Holy Spirit as dweller in the soul, will also in body be given life because of the dignity of so great a dweller.

¶ For this reasoning the text expresses to the letter, giving the reason for future immortality because of His Spirit dwelling in us. But when he says “will give life,” understand it not of the mere gift of life (since in the future age both the good and the bad will live), but understand perfect vivification, which excludes all passibility. For only such vivification totally frees from the law of death. For the damned will be under the law of death—not in that they will die again, but in that they will continually suffer, which is continually to die. But the vivification of bodies because of the Holy Spirit dwelling will exclude not only dying but any suffering whatsoever, not only in act but in potency; for He will render bodies immortal and impassible. Nor does he say “your dead bodies,” but “your mortal bodies,” to include all. I say this because of those who will be found alive at the second coming of Christ; for their bodies, not dead but mortal, will be given life.

¶ “Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, that we should live according to the flesh.” From so many differences spoken between flesh and spirit, and from so many gifts of the spirit for freeing us from those things that belong to the flesh, he infers to which of the two parts in us we are debtors, so that from here he may proceed to show the mode by which we attain that vivification and by which we glory in hope of the glory of God. For the cause has been stated: the Holy Spirit

TO THE ROMANS

dwelling in us. But the mode is to act according to the spirit. And therefore he infers the debt of such work.

¶ “For if you live according to the flesh, you will die.” From the fruit of the work he proves that we are debtors not to the flesh but to the spirit. For the fruit of carnal life is described as death, both of soul and of body, according to eternal suffering.

¶ “But if by the spirit.” Understand: by the Holy Spirit dwelling in your spirit; or (which is the same), by your spirit supported by the Holy Spirit.

¶ “You mortify the deeds of the flesh.” Against living according to the flesh he sets “by the spirit mortify the deeds of the flesh.” He does not say “kill,” but “mortify,” so that we may understand, in accordance with the doctrine stated above, that we cannot extinguish carnal deeds but can mortify them: both by restraining them when they arise, and by taming the flesh so that they do not arise, and by continuously exercising those things that belong to the spirit or tend to the spirit.

¶ “You will live.” Behold the contrary fruit. And the discourse is about the blessed life of soul and body.

¶ “For whoever are led by the Spirit of God.” He proves what he last said: that “if by the spirit you mortify the deeds of the flesh, you will live.” He proves it from the side of the spirit, joining such living to the glory of the sons of God. For he tends, as was said, to declare that through the gift of Christ we have this good, namely, that we glory in hope of the glory of God. And therefore he proves “you will live” by proving that you are sons of God, for the blessed life is that of the sons of God. When you hear “are led by the Spirit of God,” beware lest you understand frenzy, lest you understand men to be led by the Spirit of God as though mad; rather understand such and so great an obedience of our spirit to the Holy Spirit dwelling in perfect men that, by obeying, they are led as most obedient by the Holy Spirit dwelling in them. Yet one is led not only unwillingly or unknowingly, but also most promptly obeying. And according to this mode holy men are said to be led by the Spirit of God.

CHAPTER EIGHT

¶ “These are sons of God.” The discourse is about adopted sons. And he fittingly joins these two: to be sons of God and to be led by the Spirit of God. For it belongs to sons to show themselves so most obedient to the father that they are led by the father’s spirit, so that they act at the father’s nod.

¶ “For you have not received the spirit of bondage again in fear.” He proves that those who are led by the Spirit of God are sons of God from this: that the Spirit of God dwelling in them is a spirit of adoption, and not a spirit of bondage and fear, as was the state under the old Law. For by this, that he says “again,” he shows that he speaks relatively to the reception of the old Law, for then they received from God a spirit for the first time, but of bondage in fear—of legal bondage, and in fear both external (because they were terrified in the letter by thunders sounding, so that they recoiled and said to Moses, “Let not the Lord speak to us lest we die,” and so forth) and internal (because they did not receive grace through the Law, but, left to themselves, they were in fear of transgressing and incurring punishments). Nor does this spirit of bondage and fear signify the gift of grace that makes pleasing to God, but a divine motion to accept the Law.

¶ “Not so now,” says St. Paul, “is it with you”: but I therefore called you sons of God because you have not received, on this second occasion, a spirit of bondage in fear; you have not been moved by God to accept the bondage of the Law without grace.

¶ “But you have received the Spirit of adoption.” The word “of sons” is superfluous. Over against the spirit of bondage in fear, he sets the spirit of adoption, that is, the spirit of adopted sons: that is, you have received the Holy Spirit dwelling in you to move you to actions befitting adopted sons of God. Nor was it necessary to say “a spirit of love” or “a spirit of adoption in love,” as he had said “of bondage in fear,” because adoption posits sonship and love, all the more precisely insofar as adoption implies a gratuitous sonship that kindles love toward the adopter.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “In whom we cry: Abba, Father.” “Abba” is a Syriac word; “Father” is Latin, though borrowed from the Greeks; and they signify the same. And because “Father” is the nominative case, it is reasonable that “Abba” is likewise the nominative. Nor does he say “in whom we say” (which is common to all Christians), but “in whom we cry,” because of the greatness of affection, which is proper to true sons, so that from the fact that we cry (that is, with great affection we pour ourselves out) “Father, Father” in the Holy Spirit, we may recognize that we have an internal sign that we have received the Spirit of adoption. For if He were not the Spirit of adoption, He would not so confidently inspire us to call God Father. And the name “Father” is doubled to signify the firmness and certainty of confidence.

¶ “For the Spirit Himself”—understand: the Holy Spirit dwelling in us—“gives testimony”—that is, bears witness—“together with our spirit that we are sons of God.” Behold the reason for the cry, that is, for the great confidence by which God is acknowledged as Father. Here observe that in the Greek text the sense is not directly the same as the Latin interpreter sounds, for the Greek sounds of two witnesses (namely, the Holy Spirit and our spirit) concerning the same thing, namely, that we are sons of God; but the Latin has one witness (namely, the Holy Spirit) testifying not to us but to our spirit that we are sons of God. And which of these is true and comes to the same thing is resolved thus: since St. Paul wrote in Greek, the literal sense is what the Greek text sounds, namely, that the Holy Spirit is a witness together with our spirit, both bearing witness to us that we are sons of God.

¶ This testimony the Holy Spirit bears together with our spirit that we are sons of God is signified to be internal by the fact that it is borne by each internal spirit, not to others but to ourselves. And because this testimony is not about what is possible but about what is fact (that is, it is not that we can be sons of God, but that we are sons of God), therefore it is a special gift. For the testimony that we can be sons of God is contained among the common testimonies of the sons; but the testimony “I am a son of God” is a special gift.

CHAPTER EIGHT

¶ And because the effect of no testimony is to see or know the thing testified, but to believe (for testimony is not introduced, but light or a reason making evidence, in order that the thing be seen or known; rather, testimony is introduced in order that the thing testified be believed, in order that it be seen that it must be believed to be so as is testified), therefore from this testimony of the Holy Spirit and of our spirit that we are sons of God, do not understand that I see or know, but that I believe that I am a son of God—indeed, that I see that it must be believed by me that I am a son of God.

¶ The means the Holy Spirit uses, which the Holy Spirit assumes together with ours in bearing testimony that we are sons of God, are regularly two. One is the love of God prompt to obey the Holy Spirit, which the Holy Spirit produces in those who are led by the Spirit of God; otherwise they would not be led by the Spirit of God, unless perhaps for a moment. The other is an experienced continuity of divine governance: by guarding from condemnable things, enlightening, inspiring, stirring, moving, fostering, and the like. For when we experience ourselves to love God so promptly and to be governed by God with such and so great a care, we have a testimony from the Holy Spirit and from our spirit sufficient to the highest degree for believing that we are sons of God; for from this testimony we clearly see that we must believe that we are sons of God. But if we have not profited so far as to have this testimony from the Holy Spirit and from our spirit, let us strive to produce in ourselves promptness to do the things of the spirit and to mortify the things of the flesh and of the world, lest we lack the grace of so great a testimony.

¶ “But if sons, then heirs.” For someone is adopted as a son so that he may be an heir.

¶ “Heirs indeed of God.” Since one is heir only of one who is dead, how does St. Paul say “heirs of God,” since God is immortal? The solution is this: to inherit among men has two conditions, one of perfection and the other of imperfection. For it belongs to perfection that the heir acquire and possess all the goods of the father as lord; but it belongs to

TO THE ROMANS

imperfection that, for this effect, the father's death intervene. That death must intervene because father and heir cannot both at once be lords of the whole without the harm of one, namely of the father, who strips himself of the freedom of lordship by the very fact that he takes his son into co-lordship of all. Therefore the sons of God are heirs of God insofar as inheritance signifies perfection, with imperfection excluded. For the sons of God are constituted lords over all the goods of God without any detriment to God the Father, and, what is more, without any diminution in any heir.

¶ “But co-heirs with Christ.” The discourse is about Christ as man, under whose feet all things are subjected. But we are decreed co-heirs not by partition but by communion of inheritance.

¶ “If indeed we suffer with Him.” He infers that we glory in afflictions from that: “we glory in hope of the glory of God,” treating both goods together, because through afflictions we attain the glory of the sons of God. Nor is “to suffer with” taken as “to have compassion,” but as “to suffer together,” to endure afflictions and pressures together—together, that is, with respect to Christ. For the sense is: if indeed we suffer together, that is, if by imitating Christ we suffer the world's afflictions.

¶ “That we may also be glorified with Him.” For he added this condition for co-heirs of Christ, namely that they be like Christ in this life, who have been instituted as co-heirs of Christ in the future life.

¶ “For I judge.” He forestalls complaints about this condition as though it were hard, namely that one must suffer in this life in order to obtain the inheritance in the future; and he forestalls them by showing that present afflictions are not proportionate to future glory. Nor does he say “I judge” as an opinion, but he manifests the knowledge he has. For the Greek word would have been more rightly rendered “I reckon” or “I consider,” so that certain knowledge would have been expressed.

¶ “That the sufferings of this time are not worthy.” That is, not this or that suffering, but universally whatever sufferings, that is, afflictions,

CHAPTER EIGHT

tortures, torments, and so forth, not of one hour or day but of this whole time.

¶ “To the future glory.” He does not say “to the punishment of sins,” lest he contradict Job saying, “Would that my sins, by which I have deserved wrath, were weighed, and the calamity that I suffer in the balance; it would appear heavier than the sand of the sea,” in Job, chapter seven. Again, he does not say “the meritorious acts are not worthy,” “the meritorious patience is not worthy of future glory,” but he says “the sufferings are not worthy,” lest he contradict himself writing to Timothy: “I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith; as for the rest, the crown of justice is laid up for me, which the Lord, the just Judge, will render to me on that day.” Therefore it is signified that the sufferings themselves, insofar as they are such, do not merit future glory as condignly; which is to say that the evil of the sufferings of this time is not equal to the good of future glory, but that what we suffer in this time is far less evil than the good of future glory.

¶ “Which will be revealed in us.” Although the Greek text is ambiguous as to “in you” or “into us,” nevertheless “in us” better fits the context, to signify the glory that in the future will remain in us. For it will exist inwardly in our souls and bodies, unlike present glory, which, although it is a clear fame with praise, consists not in us but in the acts of others. And he says “will be revealed,” because then the glory of the saints, which is now hidden as though in root in their merits, will be made manifest.

¶ “For the expectation.” One word is lacking. It must be read: “For the anxious expectation of the creature.”

¶ With a twofold intention of proving the last statement (namely, that the sufferings of this time are not worthy of future glory), first he proves it from the vehemence of appetite or expectation in the Apostles themselves. And each reason consists in this: that anxious expectation, common both to every nation and to the Apostles (which expectation, indeed, is simply and absolutely vigorous in them), is expectation of the glory of adoption, and not of the good that is taken away by the

TO THE ROMANS

sufferings of this time, which they patiently endure while expecting that glory of adoption. For from this vehemence of expectation, common both to every nation and to the Apostles, we have in this life a sign testifying that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy of the future glory in us. And by a skillful device St. Paul teaches the magnitude of future glory from the magnitude not of a bare appetite but of an expectant appetite, not of any one individual but common both to every nation and to the Apostles, because the magnitude of the good that is the end and object of appetite is known from the common vehemence, not of a mere wish but of expectation, according to the reasoning of true philosophy. Consider the individual points.

¶ He significantly says “expectation,” not only to exclude mere wishing (which is even of impossibilities), but also to exclude the desire of a man still uncertain about the future good. For to expect belongs to one who is certain about a future good. And he speaks not of any expectation, but of “anxious expectation,” so that from the anxiety itself he may describe the greatest vehemence of expectation. For anxious expectation implies so vehement a desire that it continually solicits itself and produces sorrow from lacking the expected thing. St. Paul could indeed have signified the vehemence of expectation by another word, but he preferred to signify it through anxiety, because, as we experience in sense, solicitous sorrow most strongly bears witness to the magnitude of our affection toward a good.

¶ Now by the name “creature,” since it is clear that he does not mean every creature (as the blessed angels testify, to whom what follows does not apply), and since in the Gospel we find that by the name “every creature” every nation is signified (Christ saying, “Preach the Gospel to every creature”), it follows that it fits both Sacred Scripture and the context of the present letter that by “creature” is meant every nation, every condition of men. And every condition or nation is called here (as in the Gospel) “creature” to explain the reason why the discourse is about nations, namely because of what they have from God the Creator. For by this name everything of sin in any nation and condition of men is

CHAPTER EIGHT

excluded, and consequently everything that accompanies sin. And the sense is: the anxious expectation of nations, insofar as they have what they have from the Creator, not insofar as they have something of sin mixed in.

¶ “Awaits the revelation of the sons of God.” And in this the negative is contained: that the anxious expectation of the creature does not tend to the good of this time, of which the sufferings of this time deprive. For from the fact that it tends by undoubting expectation to the state of the manifestation of the sons of God, it clearly follows that it does not tend to the good of the present time; and thus it is manifestly had that the anxious expectation of the creature prefers future glory to the goods of the present time, which is to say that the evils of the present time are lesser than the good of future glory.

¶ “For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but because of Him who subjected it, in hope.” The word “it” is superfluous. He proves from an extrinsic cause first that the anxious expectation of the creature awaits the manifest state of the sons of God. Now the extrinsic causes are two: final and efficient. Therefore he touches each: the final, by saying “because of Him,” namely God; the efficient, by saying “who subjected.” And according to three things assumed (namely expectation, anxiety, and the glory of the sons of God), he likewise asserts three: hope, by which expectation is proved; the state subject to vanity, contrary to the glory of adoption (for by “vanity” in Scripture are understood the vicissitudes of this time, both goods and evils, to which all are subject); and the mode, namely “not willingly but because of God,” to prove anxiety.

¶ And he says “not willingly” not only because the creature neither wanted nor chose this, but rather because this state does not please the creature: it does not remain in this state voluntarily. But it endures this state because of God as an end to be merited. And the sense and force of the proof are this: because the creature is subject to the vanity of this time (under which are included all temporal goods and evils), and the creature has such a state unwillingly (for if this state pleased, there would not be a

TO THE ROMANS

true anxious expectation of a future state), but endures this state because of God as an end to be merited; and because God Himself established this subjection not as lasting forever but, in hope, as passing over to Himself, to the state of the glory of the sons of God; therefore from this it is best inferred that the anxious expectation of the creature is toward the state of the glory of adoption. For from this is had the reason for expectation from the establishment of hope; from this is had the reason for anxiety, from the fact that it lacks what is hoped for, since it is unwillingly subjected to a contrary state in order to merit God.

¶ “Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God.” He proves the same from an intrinsic cause, although this proof directly tends to prove that statement, namely “the expectation of the creature,” and its proof, namely “He subjected it in hope.” For he proves from the future liberation of the creature from the intrinsic evil of corruption. Nay, I say less: rather from the whole bondage of corruption. For now we are not only corruptible but slaves of corruption. For of any evil, not only its incursion but also the fear of it is a kind of servitude of corruption, since, whether we will or not, we are subjected to the dominion of corruption. But when the glory of the sons of God comes, we will be freed from this servitude, transferred into liberty not only from corruption and from the yoke of corruption, but (what is more) into such liberty, namely the liberty of the glory of the sons of God, which contains far more than liberty from bondage of corruption.

¶ “For we know that every creature groans and labors in childbirth until now.” That is, “groans together and labors together in childbirth until now.” After he has declared the extrinsic and intrinsic causes of the creature’s anxious expectation, he now declares the anxious expectation itself from the effect manifesting anxiety, which shows the utmost vehemence of expectation. And because his discourse was not about this or that creature but universally, he now explains both “every creature” and the common anxiety, saying “groans together and labors together.” And from the authority of certain knowledge which the Apostles and

CHAPTER EIGHT

similar pastors, bearing care of the Churches, have, he manifests it by saying “we know,” we Apostles, that “every creature,” not some creature, that is, every nation insofar as it has what it has from God, groans together and labors together: it agrees in this effect of expectation, that it bursts forth into groaning and sorrow like those in labor, expecting the glory of adoption. For from the fact that lacking the expected glory brings forth these effects, the expectation is manifestly shown to be very vehement and anxious.

¶ And he brought the likeness of labor-pains not with respect to the cause (namely, that her hour has come), but with respect to the expected fruit, to signify sorrow in hope of fruit. But the adverb “until now” shows the time of this present life, as though he said: during the time of this present life. For as long as this time lasts, every nation groans together and labors together in childbirth—not every man in every nation, but the nation in the common condition—expecting the glory of the sons of God. For no nation, no condition, no rank, no state, no sex, no rational age is excepted from this anxious expectation, as martyrdoms testify, and as the perfection of spiritual life found vigorous in every condition of men, in every state, in every sex, and so forth testifies.

¶ “And not only it.” He adds a second reason from a like anxious expectation in the Apostles, which he shows from the same effect, namely groaning, so that from the testimony of primacy as well the incomparability of glory to the sufferings of this time may become known.

¶ “But even we ourselves, having the firstfruits of the Spirit.” By likeness to the firstfruits of the fruits of the earth, the greater gifts of the Spirit are described (for firstfruits are more desired, precious, and pleasing; hence they were also dedicated to God), to signify that the Apostles had the more precious and more desirable gifts of the Holy Spirit, and the gifts more pleasing to God. And he said this so that from so great an elevation of the Apostles the testimony concerning the magnitude of glory might have greater authority.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “Even we ourselves groan within ourselves.” That is, “we groan together.” For common groaning is signified of the Apostles, not in an external sound, but in an interior readiness breaking forth into the act of groaning.

¶ “Awaiting the adoption.” The interpreter added, for greater explication, two words, “of sons of God.” It must be read: “awaiting the adoption.” Here he explains both the reason for groaning in the Apostles and in every creature—namely, expectation of adoption—and the time of groaning—namely, the time of expectation—so that we may understand that throughout this whole time there is groaning because of lacking the expected adoption.

¶ “The redemption of our body.” Unless he had added, appositionally, “the redemption of our body,” you might have been in doubt how St. Paul says that he and others await adoption, when he said that we have already received the Spirit of adoption and are sons of adoption; but now, from the fact that, when he says “awaiting adoption,” he appositionally explains “the redemption of our body,” he removes all ambiguity, explaining that the adoption awaited is and is said to be with respect to the redemption of the body. For our body, which up to the glory of the resurrection is held under the captivity and dominion of corruption, will be redeemed by the second effect of liberation, by the price first paid on the Cross, when it rises or is made immortal by the gift of glory, which we have been adopted to inherit.

¶ “For we are saved by hope.” He proves two things at once. One is that such expectation suits the state of our salvation, because we have been saved by Christ in hope, not in the possession of eternal inheritance. Hence the consonance of expectation with the state of our salvation in this life is manifest. The other (which St. Paul chiefly intends) concerns what he had said above: “if indeed we suffer with Him that we may also be glorified with Him.” So that the learned reader may penetrate the context, let him compare the conclusion of this clause—namely, “by patience we await”—with those words, “if indeed we suffer with Him,” not yet proved, and with all that intervenes in the text. For it is clear that

CHAPTER EIGHT

after he added that condition (“if indeed we suffer with Him”), he did not immediately prove it, but forestalled it lest it be held a hard condition. He forestalls it by showing the sufferings of this time to be unequal to future glory in us, from the anxious expectation both of every creature and of the Apostles. Therefore the order of the context required that, once the forestalling was completed, he return—indeed, proceed—to prove the added condition, namely “if indeed we suffer with Him that we may also be glorified with Him.” And he proves this condition directly, asserting as reason: “for we are saved by hope.”

¶ Someone can be saved in two ways: either by being immediately transferred into the reality of the end, or by being transferred into the reality of the end through an intermediate state of hope. Christ did not save us in the first way (for He did not even save Himself in the first way, but willed to arrive at His glory through merits), but in the second way. And he says both: that we “have been saved” (that is, we have not acquired the state of salvation from ourselves but have received it from another; this the passive manner of speaking signifies), and that we have been given the state of salvation not in the reality of the end but in hope. From this St. Paul begins the reasoning to prove “if indeed we suffer with Him.” Hence he adds:

¶ “But hope that is seen is not hope.” The reasoning of the text consists in two inferences: “we are saved by hope; therefore what we do not see we hope for; therefore by patience we await.” He proves the first inference from this, that hope—that is, the hoped-for thing—that is seen is not hope, that is, it is not hoped for. And he proves this by adding:

¶ “For what a man sees, why does he also hope for?” It must be read: “Why does he also hope for?” For it is signified that there is no longer place for hope when vision is present.

¶ “But if we hope for what we do not see, by patience we await it.” This second inference he leaves without proof as something established.

¶ Consider each point. First, a question arises concerning the truth of the premises, because it does not seem repugnant to a hoped-for thing that it be seen: one hopes for the Roman kingdom which is seen; one

TO THE ROMANS

hopes for a great reward set before certain soldiers, and so forth, which is seen. Nor is it enough to answer by saying that the present discourse is about theological hope, because St. Paul manifestly proves from the common features of all hope, as his most universal words clearly testify: “for what a man sees, why does he also hope for?” The solution is that the hoped-for thing is made up of two: the thing itself, which sometimes pre-exists (such as God, a kingdom, a city, and the like), and the attainment of the thing. For what is hoped for is the attainment of the kingdom or city, and likewise the attainment of God. And this attainment is most properly the hoped-for thing, for by hope we directly tend to the kingdom as to be attained, and so with the others. And it is of this hoped-for thing that St. Paul speaks, saying that it is not seen.

¶ Therefore he does not intend to say that the pre-existing thing toward which hope tends to attain is not seen, but that the hoped-for thing formally (that is, the hoped-for attainment) is not seen. Moreover, to see and to be seen, in the present matter, is common both to the vision of the bodily eyes and to the vision of the mind. And the sense is that the attainment that is hoped for is not evidently perceived, because what is evidently perceived as to be had, that is, as to be had in the future, by that very fact that it is evidently known to be, loses the character of the arduous, loses the character of the difficult, and thus is no longer under hope. For the attainment, however arduous in itself, if it is evidently perceived as going to be, is now secure, now no longer has the character of the difficult, and is now no longer hoped for.

¶ Hence a leader of an army, when the battle has been brought to such a point that he evidently perceives—by no mere probable conjecture—the attainment of victory, no longer hopes for victory, but pursues it by another affection of the soul, namely love, desire, and an incipient delight. And by these points it is clear that the force of the first inference consists in the proper condition of the thing that is hoped for, because it is founded upon the arduousness of attainment. For from the fact that the attainment, so long as it is hoped for, is arduous, it follows that it is not seen, that is, not evidently known to be; for if it were evidently

CHAPTER EIGHT

perceived as to be, it would cease to be arduous for the one who sees, as being evidently secured.

¶ But that second inference, set down in the text without proof under the form of a conditional, has a difficulty, because its formality does not appear, since it does not hold in every matter. For emperors of armies hope for victory which they do not see, and yet they do not await it by patience. Nor did this escape St. Paul; indeed, between these two inferences he insinuated a difference from his manner of speaking. For he proved the first as formal from the common notion of hope, using “hope” absolutely (“hope that is seen is not hope,” and, “what a man sees, why does he also hope for?”), which are most common to those who hope. But he introduces the second by applying it to us, saying, “but if we hope for what we do not see,” so that we might understand that he introduces this by descending and applying it to the proposed matter, namely to our hope of divine inheritance; thus we understand that the first inference is common from common notions, but this is proper to the proposed matter and is founded not on hope absolutely, but on hope contracted to the proposed matter. And therefore, although it is not formal concerning hope absolutely, it is nevertheless formal concerning hope contracted to the proposed matter.

¶ To grasp this, know that, speaking in general, from the fact that the hoped-for attainment is not seen, it follows that it is not evidently secure and thus is uncertain and subject to difficult dangers. From this it follows that the one who hopes must be prepared to overcome dangers. But because this readiness to overcome dangers can exist not in one way but in many ways—for it can be by magnanimity of assaulting, as happens in temporal kingdoms of this kind that men attain by their own actions; or it can be by patience of enduring all evils so that the attainment of so great a good is not impeded, as happens in goods hoped for not from one’s own actions but from another’s gift (such as the good we hope for)—therefore St. Paul inferred “by patience we await” not from common notions of hope insofar as it is hope, but from hope contracted and applied to the divine inheritance hoped for by us. For

TO THE ROMANS

when we hope for an attainment uncertain amid many dangers, to be had not by our ingenuity, powers, and actions, but from God's gift, we must await it from another (namely God) by patience, tolerating the evils of all dangers. For by patiently enduring the evils of this time, we overcome the difficult dangers of attainment.

¶ And thus he proved the added condition, "if indeed we suffer with Him that we may also be glorified with Him," from this, that "we are saved by hope": hope entails that we do not see the hoped-for attainment, and the hoped-for attainment, not seen by us, entails that we await by patience.

¶ Likewise the Spirit also helps our weakness—or rather, our weaknesses. Here he begins to treat the fourth good of the justified, namely, that we glory in God, while at the same time continuing what precedes. For when he has declared that through the Holy Spirit we glory in the hope of the glory of God, because he is the Spirit of adoption, he consequently adds that, just as he is the Spirit of adoption, so in like manner he is the Spirit who helps our weaknesses. In order that from the fact that he is the Spirit of adoption we may understand that we have the sonship of God, but from the fact that he is the Spirit helping our weaknesses we may recognize that our progress is helped by that same Spirit. And that just as, through the Holy Spirit dwelling in us, insofar as he is the Spirit of adoption, we glory in the hope of the glory of God while suffering, so through that same Holy Spirit dwelling in us, insofar as he is also the Spirit helping our frailties, we glory in God. And fittingly he postponed explaining this office of the Spirit dwelling in us until after the necessity of suffering with Christ had been shown, so that we may understand that the Holy Spirit helps our weaknesses not only with respect to goods to be done, but also with respect to evils to be borne. The manner, moreover, in which he helps (both on our side and on God's side as the one carrying it out) is added.

¶ For we do not know what we should pray for as we ought. St. Paul does not leap from the help given to frailties to ignorance of prayer; rather, from the fact that the Holy Spirit supplies the ignorance of our

CHAPTER EIGHT

prayers, he proves that the Holy Spirit helps our frailties, in order to teach us that we cannot help our weaknesses by our own ingenuity, powers, or works, but that, by means of prayer, we must await being helped by God. Therefore, since our first weapons for aiding our weaknesses are prayers, from the supplying of these he declares that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of help.

¶ But when it is said that we do not know what we should pray for as we ought, understand the mode signified by “as we ought” on the side of the thing to be asked of God. And the sense is that although we know what we should pray for, we nonetheless do not know the mode in which the thing asked is expedient or necessary for us. For example, we know that eternal salvation is to be sought, but I do not know the mode in which eternal salvation ought, or is expedient, to be communicated to me, or acquired by me. For there are infinitely many modes by which it can be acquired, and the mode that is useful for one is not useful for another; and we sometimes believe some mode to be useful for us which, in truth, is not expedient for us—as is evident in St. Paul, who asked that the angel of Satan be taken away from him, thinking such a mode to be useful to him, and yet it was not truly expedient for him. He therefore teaches ignorance of the particular modes that are expedient for each, by saying that we do not know what we should pray for as we ought, in order from this to signify our need for the help of the Holy Spirit.

¶ Understand, moreover, this ignorance with respect to those things whose affirmation and whose negation can both stand together with eternal salvation, and not with respect to those things that are of necessity for salvation—such as believing, hoping, loving God and one’s neighbor for God’s sake, being merciful, patient, kind, penitent, meek, and the like. For we know that these are to be sought; but the modes, events, occurrences, and suchlike that are expedient or necessary for me for the preservation and increase of these, I do not know in particular. And for that reason I do not know what I should pray for, as I ought, in order to attain them.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ But the Spirit himself petitions for us with inexpressible groanings. Behold the supply by which the Holy Spirit petitions for us in those modes of eternal salvation unknown to us. Beware here, first of all, lest you take an argument that the Holy Spirit is not God, because to petition for us is repugnant to God, since petitioning belongs to one who is inferior, and hence it does not befit even the Son of God except by reason of his human nature. For St. Paul does not mean that the Holy Spirit, in himself or according to himself, prays or petitions; but that, dwelling in us, he petitions according to our acts. This is the same as to say that he makes us petition, or that he moves us to petition, and inspires petitions in us. And that this sense is intended by St. Paul is proved from the words added, namely, “with inexpressible groanings.” For one must either confess that inexpressible groanings belong to the Holy Spirit according to himself (which is ridiculous), or else that the discourse is about petitioning in us, which is by our inexpressible groanings.

¶ And those groanings are called inexpressible—those groanings whose termini, to which they tend, are unknown to us. For that reason they are called, and are, inexpressible, because for us the matter to which they tend is unknown; for what is unknown to us is also inexpressible for us. We experience such groanings in ourselves when, praying with burning desire, we ask to be directed or led to eternal salvation and the like, not knowing which of the things that occur is more expedient for us. By such groanings, inexpressible for us because we do not know the particular termini, the particular remedies or helps for the obtaining of which they tend, the Holy Spirit petitions for us, because the Holy Spirit dwelling in us directs them to what is useful to be obtained for us.

¶ But he who searches hearts knows—or, knew—what the Spirit desires. The term rendered “desires” is not a verb but a noun in Greek; and it is that same term previously rendered by different interpreters as prudence, wisdom, sense, affection, care, or thought. Hence there is diversity here: some render it “what prudence the Spirit has,” others “what sense the Spirit has,” others “what affection the Spirit has,” others “what care the Spirit has.” But it matters little for the meaning, because

CHAPTER EIGHT

they come together into the same thing: the sense is that God, the searcher of hearts, has known in what particular way the care of the Holy Spirit tends, as he thus petitions in us.

¶ For the care of the Holy Spirit, making us petition thus in a confused way, would indeed be vain unless there were present God, from whom the request is made, understanding what in particular the Holy Spirit intends to obtain in us for us. And he says “knew” in the past, lest some new knowledge be believed to come to be in God. And the discourse is about knowledge of approval, as is said contrariwise to the foolish virgins, “I do not know you.” The sense is that God has known by approving what the Holy Spirit intends to ask through our groanings that are inexpressible for us. He mentions God according to the office of searching hearts because approving petitions in particular depends on exact knowledge of hearts in their deepest interior. For the one who provides for what is truly expedient for me must know my heart—what it would do in this event and what in another, and what after a second and a third and then subsequent events—indeed, not in this or that matter only, but in all occurrences; otherwise it would happen that he would admit some useless or harmful petition, even if only by accident, or would make a provision accordingly.

¶ And here begins the fruit of the Holy Spirit’s supplying: for it would profit nothing for the help of our weaknesses that he petition for us unless the petition were approved. For this approval, on God’s side, is the beginning of the help by which the Holy Spirit is said to help us by petitioning him.

¶ Because he petitions for the saints according to God. From this it is clear that the discourse is about knowledge of approval, when he says, “he knew what prudence,” or “sense,” of the Spirit. For this rendering of the cause would be false if the discourse were about simple knowledge; for by simple knowledge God knows petitions even that are not according to God, but by knowledge of approval he knows only those petitions that are according to God, and therefore he approves them because they are according to God. He therefore gives the reason why

TO THE ROMANS

God, from eternity, approved what the Holy Spirit petitions in us: because the Holy Spirit petitions according to God for the saints.

¶ By one phrase, namely, “according to God,” the Apostle signifies the whole of what is asked “as it ought,” that is, those things which, all things considered, are necessary for the salvation of each saint. For what he previously said, “as we ought,” he now says, “according to God.” And it contains whatever, according to the disposition of the divine order, truly is expedient for each saint.

¶ We know, however, that all things work together for good for those who love God. The Greek text is ambiguous as to whether “all things” is in the nominative or in the accusative, and again as to whether “work together” is plural or “works together” is singular. The interpreter understood “all things” in the nominative and “work together” in the plural. But to read “all things” in the accusative and “works together” in the singular fits the meaning and the context on every side. For the sense is: we know, however, that God works all things together for good for those who love God, and so forth.

¶ And this sense fits the subsequent reasoning: “for those whom he foreknew and predestined.” For it is certain that God is understood when it is said “he foreknew and predestined,” and thus it is God, not the Holy Spirit—especially since it is expressly added “of his Son.” It also fits what precedes, when he said, “he who searches hearts knew,” and so forth; for it is clear that God is there understood. And likewise it fits the last phrase, namely, “according to God”: for St. Paul asserts that he, together with the other Apostles, knows what “according to God” is, and he declares it to us, namely, that God works all things together for good for the saints, and so forth. For in this manner the Holy Spirit petitions in us for the saints; and at the same time he explains, on God’s side as the searcher of hearts, the carrying out of the help of our weaknesses which the Holy Spirit effects by petitioning in us, so that from this we may perceive that our inexpressible groanings are directed by the Holy Spirit to this end: that God may carry this into execution, namely, that he works all things together for good for the saints. For the law and order of

CHAPTER EIGHT

divine providence is that even what God has disposed that he himself will do, he fulfills by means of secondary causes, among which is the Holy Spirit insofar as he, dwelling in us, petitions with inexpressible groanings for the saints.

¶ And by saying “all things,” he excludes nothing that in any way pertains to each saint. For the present discourse is directly about the saints distributively, and not about the universal collection of saints, for whose good there is no doubt that God orders all things, even hell; for even hell turns to the glory of the saints. But the present discourse is about individual saints, concerning any one of whom that evangelical saying can be verified, “He will set him over all his goods”; yet the intention of the present text directly tends to this, that God, even in this life, brings about that all things in any way pertaining to any saint whatsoever, or in any way redounding upon him, are worked together unto his good.

¶ He says “works together,” and he does not say “works,” so that we may understand that not the grace of God alone, but at the same time the free choice of the elect, jointly produces the good of the elect. And he says “for those who love God,” to distinguish the saints insofar as at some time they are not loving God; for the restriction is made by saying “for those who love God.” Hence it is not necessary to raise questions about those things that befell St. Paul, St. Augustine, and the like before they were in the state of loving God, since the text itself expressly restricts this to those loving God.

¶ For those who are called according to his purpose. The word “saints” is superfluous. And “called” is not a participle but a noun, as though one were to say “those summoned.” A second restrictive condition is added, so that the discourse is understood not of all those who love God, but only of those who are summoned according to the divine purpose. Here you can observe that these two conditions are joined so that each restricts the other. For the state of loving God restricts those who are summoned, so that the present discourse is understood not of the predestined in every state of theirs, but according to the state in

TO THE ROMANS

which they love God. And likewise the present discourse is understood not of all who love God, but only of those who both love God and are predestined. For there are many who at some time are in the state of loving God who nevertheless are not predestined; and of these he does not say that God works all things together for good for them, but only for those who have both conditions together.

¶ But what the divine purpose is, St. Paul immediately adds: for those whom he foreknew and predestined—rather, predetermined—to become conformed to the image of his Son, so that he himself might be the firstborn among many brothers. Note, concerning the letter, the difference between the conjunction of these two (he foreknew and he predestined) and the rest that follow. For in the rest that follow there is always the relative “whom” and the pronoun “these,” saying, “whom he predestined, these he called,” and “whom he called, these he also justified,” and so forth. But in joining these two, no pronoun is found in the Greek text, so that it is not said, “whom he foreknew, these he also predestined,” but “whom he foreknew and predestined,” so that the very difference might insinuate some mystery.

¶ Note, next, that in the rest the verbs “he called,” “he justified,” “he glorified” are said absolutely without any added phrase; but these two have an added phrase, namely, “to become conformed to the image of his Son,” and so forth. Note, third, that he does not say “conformed to the image” in the dative, but “conformed of the image” in the genitive, and so it stands in Greek. For it is not signified “conformed to the image of the Son of God.” For such conformity would be mediated, because it would be conformity to his image, and through the image, conformity to him—just as if someone were said to be conformed to the statue of Caesar, he would be conformed to Caesar in a mediated way, and would truly be said to be conformed to the image of Caesar. But in the proposed matter I would not know how to understand such a sense, because I do not know any image of the Son of God to which the saints decreed are to have conformity.

CHAPTER EIGHT

¶ Therefore the sense is: conformed among themselves by reason of the image of the Son of God. For this fits truth and apostolic doctrine, in the First Letter to the Corinthians, chapter XV: “As we have borne the image of the earthly, so we shall also bear the image of the heavenly man, Christ.” For to explain in what the decreed are conformed, “of the image” is added, that is, according to the image, or by reason of the image, according to the manner of Greek construction—not of just any image, but of the Son of God. For all the decreed are conformed according to this image, insofar as, by imitation of the natural Son, all will be sons of God, so that he, the Son of God, may thus be firstborn among many brothers.

¶ Note, fourth, that when St. Paul, in his usual manner, has proposed “we know that for those who love God,” and so forth, he now adds an explanation of the particular parts, beginning from that one, namely, “purpose.” With these preliminaries set out, know from speculative theology the difference between God’s knowledge insofar as it is of things absolutely, and insofar as it is of things as events. For although each is eternal, the first does not presuppose that God wills to create things, but the second presupposes that God wills to create things. And from this it follows that foreknowledge of these events (namely, that the saints are conformed among themselves according to the image of the Son of God so that he is firstborn, and so forth) does not precede the divine predetermination of those same events, but follows it. For first—not in time but in the order of reason—God, by willing, determines these events, and knows that they will be; indeed, the reason why he knows that they will be is that, by willing, he determines them.

¶ Therefore St. Paul does not signify that foreknowledge is the reason for predetermination, but conversely that predetermination is the reason for foreknowledge. And lest you understand foreknowledge to be the reason for predetermination, he refrained from the pronoun, as was said. For if he had said, “whom he foreknew, these he also predestined,” you would have understood an order between foreknowledge and predetermination similar to that which the subsequent members signify

TO THE ROMANS

among themselves; but by refraining from the pronoun and joining them together, he insinuated that these are together in time—indeed, in eternity—and that they have an order among themselves different from that which the subsequent members signify among themselves to have.

¶ Therefore the sense is: I said “according to purpose,” for those whom he foreknew as conformed, and so forth, and predestined—that is, he also first predestined them so that he might foreknow them—so that the prefix “pre-” placed before “destined” is referred not only to those destined but to the foreknown, though with a different order: to the former by an order of duration, to the latter by an order as it were of causality. For by saying “according to purpose” he proves this, to refute the doctrine of those who assign the first place in our salvation to divine foreknowledge of future things, who set foreknowledge of merits as the reason for divine predetermination. To refute this, he assigns the first place in our salvation to the divine purpose, saying, “to those who are called according to purpose.” And in proving this he makes manifest that the divine determination of those conformed to the Son of God is prior to divine foreknowledge of them, saying: “for those whom he foreknew and predestined,” that is, he also determined before he foreknew.

¶ But if you are oppressed by the loftiness of so subtle a sense, you can use a plainer sense: expounding foreknowledge as foreknowledge of approval. In this way, just as when he says “he who searches hearts knew what prudence the Spirit has” he speaks of knowledge of approval, so now he may speak of foreknowledge of approval. And thus the sense is plain to all: that those whom he foreknew by foreknowledge of approval, he not only approved but also predestined, which is greater; for predetermination adds firmness to approval.

¶ The image of conformity to the Son of God consists in two conditions. One is participation in the glory of the Son insofar as he is the blessed man, and this condition includes our body configured to the body of the brightness of Christ, and our soul made like Christ’s in glory, and so forth. The other is participation in the glory of the Son of God insofar as he is the Son of God; and this condition is that we are now

CHAPTER EIGHT

sons of God, and at last this sonship will appear in glory. And that this condition is principally intended by St. Paul here is clear from the fact that he speaks of the Son of God and of brothers.

¶ But the primogeniture attributed to the Son of God among many brothers must be understood not in its proper sense but metaphorically, because according to both his divine and his human natural generation, he is not only firstborn but only-begotten, and thus lacks brothers. Hence he is called firstborn among many brothers by assimilation to a firstborn among many brothers: namely, because he, the Son of God, and many others are sons of God, and thus many are brothers of that Son of God; and because he is begotten before the others, rights similar to the right of the firstborn are attributed to him, namely, that the other brothers are under him, are nourished by him, and the like. For this dignity of Christ with respect to us is signified by the fact that he is determined to be firstborn among many brothers. And he said this lest you err in understanding that we are coheirs of Christ absolutely when he had said “coheirs with Christ.” For he explains that we are coheirs with Christ as with the firstborn among all the brothers, which is to say that Christ indeed is heir of all things, and under him and through him we are coheirs, and we participate in the goods of the divine inheritance; for this law of firstborns is evident even today among princes.

¶ But those whom he predestined—rather, predetermined—these he also called: by an interior calling. For once he has explained that phrase “according to purpose,” he consequently explains the other, “called.” The difference between calling and predetermining and foreknowing is manifest: for calling is in time, but foreknowing and predetermining were from eternity; and by executing the predetermination, he calls.

¶ And those whom he called, these he also justified; and those whom he justified, these he also magnified—rather, glorified. Two questions arise. One concerns the verbs of past time in such executions (“he called,” “he justified,” “he glorified”), since these executions are future. The solution is that these executions, with respect to many, are

TO THE ROMANS

past, and with respect to many are future: for many are already called, justified, and glorified, and many still remain to be called, justified, and glorified. And it was fitting that the doctrine be delivered from what is more certain, namely, from what has already been done, and therefore he uses verbs of past time. Nonetheless it can also be said that, because of the certainty of future executions, they are signified absolutely in the past, as the Prophets do.

¶ The other question concerns the truth of these executions, for it is manifestly false that whomever he justified, those he also glorified, since many who were justified have fallen from justice and have been damned. The solution is twofold. Either by the difference between those called and justified simply and those called and justified for a time, and that here the discourse is about calling and justifying simply, whereas the objection proceeds from those called and justified for a time; for such are those who, falling from justice, are damned. Or by the difference between calling and justifying insofar as they are executions of predetermination and insofar as they are, in themselves, certain divine gifts; and that the present discourse is about these insofar as they are executions of divine predestination, for in this way it is most true that all who are justified are also glorified; whereas the objection proceeds from justification and calling insofar as they are certain graces, not insofar as they execute divine predestination. By saying, therefore, “these he also justified,” he explains that phrase “for those who love God,” for we are justified by faith working through love. And by saying, “these he also glorified,” he explains the good to which God makes all things jointly tend for the elect.

¶ What, then, shall we say to these things? He explains that phrase “God works together” by explaining the efficacy of divine cooperation, first setting down an astonishment, or the exclusion of a contrary tongue: “What, then, shall we say to these things?” that is, what shall we say against these things? as though he were to say, nothing. Or, what shall we say while looking upon these things? as though he were to say: it is not for us to speak but to be astonished while looking upon these things.

CHAPTER EIGHT

¶ If God is for us, who is against us? That is, if God brings about our good in so many ways, with such efficacy, who is against us—who, that is, will prevail against our good? as though he were to say, no one.

¶ He who did not spare his own Son—that is, he did not refrain from the emptying and affliction of his own Son—but handed him over for us all, that is, for the elect; he gave him by a liberal gift. How shall he not also, with him, give us all things—rather, will he not give? St. Paul had observed that the previously alleged reason did not effectively infer that God works all things together for good for the elect, but rather that God works together with them unto good; and therefore, to conclude effectively that it is “all things,” he added that God also liberally gave his Son for the elect, so that from this he might infer, as he does, that all things have been given to the elect together with the Son, and thus all things have been disposed unto the good of the elect. And he says “will give” in the future, to signify that the consummated execution of the good unto which God works all things together for the elect is not in the present state but in the future state of glory.

¶ Who will accuse against the elect of God? He forestalls an objection that could be made on account of sins committed by the elect; for many of the elect have committed many crimes, because of which someone could object that they remain to be punished, so that their glorification would be impeded. And these words are said directly because of that consequence, “those whom he justified, these he also glorified.” Who, he says, will accuse—who will be the accuser of past crimes against the elect of God, so that they are not glorified? as though he were to say, no one. And he adds the reason: God is the one who justifies, that is, God (not man, not an angel) who justifies, who makes the elect just from sinners.

¶ Who is the one who condemns? Reading word for word, it is to be read: who is the condemning one? With God justifying the elect from all their crimes, who will be condemning? as though he were to say, no one. Here note that he excludes both the accuser and the judge who

TO THE ROMANS

condemns, from the fact that God is the one who justifies, because no place is left for accusation or condemnation when God justifies.

¶ But because someone could object that Christ will appear as accuser and condemner—accuser, indeed, because they acted against his precepts, just as Moses is called the accuser of the Jews in the Gospel according to John, chapter V; and condemner because he himself is constituted by God as judge of the living and the dead—for this objection, I say, he adds: Christ Jesus, who died—indeed, who also rose again—who is at the right hand of God, who also petitions for us. The whole of this is to be read under one point of interrogation. For the sense is: will Christ accuse or condemn the elect, he who conferred these benefits upon us, he who has these conditions? as though he were to say: these benefits, these conditions, testify that he will not. Here note that the last words, “for us,” are to be referred to each and every one of the four benefits: he died for us; he rose again for us; he sits at the right hand of God for us; he petitions for us.

¶ Who, then, will separate us from the love of Christ—rather, of God? The word “then” is superfluous. Recall what has been proposed and said above, and consider that when he has treated three goods that the justified have (namely, peace toward God, glorying in the glory of God, and glorying in God), he now treats what remained, namely, glorying in tribulations. For St. Paul divided this treatment of glorying in afflictions by inserting one part of it (namely, the necessity of suffering) together with the second good, namely, “we glory in the glory of God,” and by inserting the other part (namely, glorying itself) under the fourth good, namely, “we glory in God,” which he has now declared so diffusely from the fact that God works all things together for good for us, by determining, calling, justifying, giving his Son, and so forth. He made this division so that we may understand that through the Holy Spirit, both insofar as he is the Spirit of adoption and insofar as he is the Spirit helping our weaknesses by petitioning, glorying in afflictions arises in us as the companion of the other two forms of glorying in this life.

CHAPTER EIGHT

¶ Therefore he treats our glorying in afflictions by way of a question, namely by raising and resolving the question whether anyone will separate the elect from the love of God. Hence the pronoun “us” designates the elect; and “from the love,” or “charity,” of God signifies the love of God toward the elect. For once such great love of God toward the elect has been narrated, that he foredetermined, foreknew, called, justified, glorified, and even gave his own Son, turning all things to their good, he most fittingly adds the question: who will separate us from the love of God, such and so great? intending (as he adds) that no one, no power, will separate the elect from God’s love toward them. They would be separated if they were to fall finally from his gifts, namely, faith, hope, charity, patience, and the other virtues.

¶ Tribulation? Having raised the question “who,” he runs through, by interrogations, seven kinds of evils, to which all the evils we can suffer in this time are reduced, so that we may perceive that he is treating the glorying of the elect in tribulations. And “tribulation,” or “affliction,” includes all torments according to the punishment of sense, that is, sensible pain short of death.

¶ Or distress? depriving bodily freedom. Or famine? depriving food. Or nakedness? depriving clothing. Or danger? which introduces fear of an imminent evil. Or persecution? which is placed third in the Greek text; I do not know by whom among the Latins it was translated into the sixth place. And “persecution” sets down the persevering continuation of action against the elect. Or the sword? depriving life.

¶ As it is written—namely, that the elect suffer—in Psalm XLIII: “Because of you,” God—because we are your worshipers—“we are put to death,” that is, whatever we suffer in the body, we say that we are being put to death, because every bodily suffering is a kind of mortification—“all the day long,” signifying persevering continuity—“we have been accounted,” to bodily evil is added the evil of such and so great contempt—“as sheep for slaughter,” that is, as though killing us were judged useful for human life, just as the slaughter of sheep in the market is useful for

TO THE ROMANS

human life. And the first Christians were truly accounted thus, as is evident to those who read the histories.

¶ But in all these things we are more than conquerors—rather, we conquer beyond measure. Responding to the question, he declares our glorying in tribulations, not content to say “we conquer,” but “we conquer beyond measure.” Our glorying is truly in these, not in some but in all; not to conquer, but to conquer beyond measure. For it is more than conquering to overcome evils and to rejoice in suffering evils. We read that this was fulfilled in the Apostles and in many martyrs.

¶ Through him who loved us. The phrase does not signify a final cause, but an efficient cause, by helping and working together. And it fits the love of God toward us, for God’s loving us is the reason for doing us good; for the love by which God loves is efficacious. And from this phrase it is clear that he spoke of the love of God toward us when he said, “Who will separate us from the love of God?” For the same love is given as the cause of our conquest beyond measure, by which we are not separated from that love of God toward us. Thus we conquer beyond measure not by our powers, not by our love, but by the gratuitous help of God, so that we may understand that this conquest beyond measure is not of habitual grace, but of God helping gratuitously. For this is signified by saying, “through him who loved us.”

¶ For I am persuaded—rather, I have been persuaded. The discourse is not about certainty of evident knowledge, but about the certainty of persuasion (which it is clear is the certainty of faith). Nor does he explain by whom he has been persuaded, since it is clear that this persuasion is from the author of faith.

¶ That neither death nor life, neither angels nor principalities nor powers. St. Paul explains four differences of things to which, most of all, a power of separating the elect from the love of God could be attributed. The first is the difference of life and death: for life is the most appetible, and death the most extreme of terrors, under which two are comprehended the rest of what is desirable and what is repulsive.

CHAPTER EIGHT

¶ The second difference is that of spiritual substances according to three diversities, namely angels, principalities, and powers. “Angel” is the name of the lowest spiritual substances; “principalities” the name of the order of those who preside over provinces; and “powers” the name of the highest order of spiritual substances ministering or carrying out. And just as by death and life he excludes all created final causes, so by the difference of these substances he excludes all created spiritual efficient causes. He comprehends them in a threefold number so that all may be understood to be included, for the number three is a number of perfection. Nor is it an obstacle that these be understood of holy angels and not only of the damned spirits, since it is not said that they will that they separate us from the love of God, but that they cannot, which is most true.

¶ Nor things present nor things to come. For about past things there could be no ambiguity. And this difference of time, since it introduces a special difficulty and ease and is most common to all causes, is deservedly added. For it matters greatly whether we are enticed by things present or by things future; and likewise whether we are terrified by things present or by things future. It matters greatly whether an action is present or future, whether a form is present or future, whether a matter is present or future.

¶ “Nor strength” is superfluous, and it is unknown who added it, since it is not found in the Greek text.

¶ Nor height nor depth. The fourth difference is that of the bodily universe according to height and depth. And St. Paul seems to have assumed only those differences that are considered according to what is common to all human beings, such as death and life, spiritual substances, time, and the bodily universe; so that under the name “height” the higher bodies are understood, and under “depth” the lower.

¶ Nor any other creature. In the manner of those who, after counting the principal things, add a general clause so that it is understood of all that they intend, St. Paul adds “nor any other creature,” so that from this we may understand that he excepts no creature.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ Will be able. Above he had spoken of the fact: “who will separate us?” and likewise of the fact: “in all these things we conquer beyond measure.” But now he speaks of what is possible, saying “will be able.” Thus he not only denies that any creature separates the elect from the love of God, but he denies that it can separate them. And the reason is at hand: because the love of God toward us is the supreme cause, superior to every creature, surpassing the power of any creature whatsoever.

¶ To separate us. The pronoun “us” designates the elect; and the discourse is about total separation, not separation for a time, which is not contrary to the love of God toward the elect, as is evident in the fall of Peter.

¶ From the love of God: active, that is, from the love of God toward us. Which is in Christ Jesus our Lord: as in the mediator and executor of that love of God toward us, so that we may understand not only that the love of Jesus Christ toward the elect is similar to the divine love, but also that the love of God toward the elect is fulfilled in the mystery, work, Passion, Resurrection, and so forth, of that same Jesus.

CHAPTER NINE

CHAPTER IX

¶ “I speak the truth in Christ; I do not lie, my conscience bearing witness to me in the Holy Spirit.” Paul does not digress, nor introduce something new; but after he treated what he proposed at the beginning (namely, that the Gospel, as to the thing preached, is the power of God unto salvation to everyone who believes), he consequently treats the other matters proposed there (namely, “to the Jew first and also to the Greek,” with the added authority, “the just man shall live by faith”) in these three chapters. And in this chapter he declares at once the manner and the cause whereby and why it is “to the Jew first and also to the Gentile” unto salvation. The manner is that it profited few Jews, but the Gentiles generally; the cause, on God’s part, is the divine purpose; but on the part of those who carry it out, it is because the Gentiles have rested in faith in Christ, whereas the Jews have rested in the justice of the law. He therefore sets before us the ruin of the Jews generally, a few excepted, with compassion, lest he seem to speak from a bad disposition toward the Jews. And he brings in Christ and the Holy Spirit as witnesses together with his own conscience. For God alone is aware of my heart. And since, for the integrity of a true statement, two things are required (one on the part of the thing said, namely that it is so; the other on the part of the speaker, namely that he does not lie—for it happens both that, without lying, something not true in the matter is put forward, and that by lying one says what in the matter is true), therefore Paul includes both. And on the part of the matter he says, “I speak the truth in Christ,” that is, that truth of which Christ is aware; and on his own part he says, “I do not lie.”

¶ “For I have great sorrow.” Behold the matter stated. “Great,” intensively. “And continual grief,” not for an hour, but enduring. “In my heart,” not superficially, but in the heart, in the inmost parts of my soul.

¶ “For I used to wish.” At once he makes manifest the matter and the cause of so great sorrow in himself, asserting the common state of his

TO THE ROMANS

Jewish brethren as once his own. For such a state of the Jews is the matter of so great sorrow. And because he himself had greatly loved that state, therefore great sorrow followed; for when we see the ruin of a thing greatly loved, we grieve greatly. Therefore, by giving the reason for his great sorrow in himself, he at the same time discloses that the matter of his sorrow is that which was once most beloved to him. Here too note his modesty. He intends to say that the cause of so great sorrow is that the Jews choose to be anathema from Christ; speaking modestly, he says this implicitly by explaining that he himself once chose to be anathema from Christ, so that from his own fault we may understand the similar sin of the other Jews persevering in Judaism. Nor does he say “I wish,” as having holy desires, but “I used to wish,” or “I wished,” formerly in the state of Judaism.

¶ “I myself,” so that we may understand that pain has succeeded to desire because he is now himself. “To be anathema from Christ.” The Greek word is called “anathema,” which by translation signifies “set apart,” just as things consecrated to God are set apart from common use. Paul indeed once, in Judaism, chose separation from Christ rather than separation from Judaism. Hence he says that he wished to be anathema from Christ absolutely and not for a time. “For my brethren.” Paul himself opens up his zeal, which he had in Judaism against Christ, to have been on account of the Jews—namely, lest the Jews, as though seduced from the state of Judaism, should pass over to the Christian state. He calls the Jews his brethren, as being from the same father, namely Jacob. “Who are my kinsmen according to the flesh,” that is (if it may be said), those of the same stock, from one lineage according to the flesh. Those whom we call blood relatives need not add “according to the flesh.”

¶ “Who are Israelites.” He explains the name from the common father of the fleshly lineage. “Whose is the adoption.” The last two words are superfluous: “of sons.” He begins to set forth the privileges of the Jews, so that the matter of sorrow may be signified as much greater from the greater loss, and at the same time the priority of the Jew according to the dignity of divine privileges may be explained. Both adoptions

CHAPTER NINE

belonged to the Israelites: the old, in Exodus chapter 4, “Israel is my firstborn son,” and the new, “It is not good to take the bread of the sons and give it to dogs”; and again Jesus says to the Israelite Apostles, “Children, yet a little while...” And “the glory”: likewise both glories belonged to the Israelites—both the old, when the glory of the Lord appeared among them, and over the tabernacle, and on Mount Sinai, and in the pillar, and the like; and the new, when the glory of Christ appeared before the three Apostles. And “the covenant,” that is, “the covenants”: Paul himself, in the Epistle to the Galatians, explains two covenants, one old on Mount Sinai, the other new, which Christ established. And it is established that both were given to the Israelites. And “the giving of the law”: for the old law was established for the Israelites, and likewise the evangelical law was given to the Israelites through Christ, both by word and by the Spirit at Pentecost. And “the worship,” that is, “the cult”: for both the old divine worship and the new, with the sacrifice of the Eucharist and the rite of baptism, was given to the Israelites. And “the promises,” that is, “the promise”: both of so many good things, and especially of the Messiah, and of eternal life and resurrection through Christ. For in all these the Israelites were privileged. For both the old things were their own, and the new things were first theirs, so that through them they might be derived to others—which pertains to their great dignity, and shows the loss of the Israelites to be greater.

¶ “Whose are the fathers.” The seventh privilege proper to the Israelites, and the greatest, is written last: namely, that Christ was born from their fathers, that Christ according to the flesh is their brother. “From whom is”—“is” is superfluous. “Christ according to the flesh,” not according to the whole of what he is, not according to the divine nature but the human. “Who is”: rendering word for word, it must be read thus: “From whom is Christ according to the flesh, who is over all things God, blessed forever. Amen.” This is the first place in which we have from Paul that Christ is God; that is, he explicitly calls Christ God, and not in any manner whatever, but “over all things, blessed forever, Amen,” so that no exception may be left to the Arians, since these conditions can be verified

TO THE ROMANS

only of the supreme God, and it is lawful to say these things only of the supreme God.

¶ “But it is not as though the word of God has failed,” supply, “as though the Israelites wish to be anathema from Christ.” Not from the truth of the adoption of Israel. “For not all who are from Israel are Israelites.” The interpreter added for clarity “are” in both places, and in place of “Israel” put “Israelites,” following the sense more than the words. Paul’s intention is to make clear that, despite so great a ruin of the Jews, the truth of the divine promise has not been diminished, because however many Israelites fall, they are not in the number of the Israelites to whom the promise was made: because they are not sons of the promise but of the flesh. Therefore, when he says, “not all who are from Israel,” he understands those who descend according to the flesh; and when he adds, “these are Israelites,” he intends that these are reckoned Israelites. “Nor because they are the seed of Abraham are they all sons.” The sense is similar: it is not because they descend carnally from Abraham that all such are reckoned sons of Abraham. “But in Isaac shall your seed be called.” Lest you think that Paul introduces this distinction among those descending both from Israel and from Abraham without the authority of Scripture—namely, that some are reckoned among the sons and some are not—he brought the authority of Genesis chapter 21, in which it is expressly shown that not all sons of Abraham, but Isaac alone, is taken up into the seed.

¶ “That is, not the sons of the flesh are the sons of God.” According to the two fathers (namely, Israel and Abraham) he explains the sense of the distinction in two ways, yet to the same effect: first, between sons of the flesh and sons of God. Hence he has that not all who descend carnally from Israel are adopted sons of God, and thus the divine adoption with respect to Israel has not failed because of the ruin of many sons of Israel according to the flesh, as being not sons of divine adoption. “But the sons of the promise.” Lest he leave room to inquire who the sons of God are, he declares this by saying that they are sons of the promise, so that, over against sons of the flesh, he distinguishes sons of the promise. Nor is

CHAPTER NINE

there need to labor much over the sense of the distinction, since Paul himself, in the Epistle to the Galatians chapter 4, explains Ishmael as born according to the flesh, but Isaac through the promise. The matter is clear in Genesis, where the conception and birth of Isaac are promised by God. Nor should you be so crude as to doubt that Isaac was conceived and born carnally. But the difference consists in this: Ishmael was according to the flesh precisely; Isaac, however, not precisely according to the flesh, but by reason of a divine miracle promised by God. For the generative power of both Sarah and Abraham was restored miraculously by God's promise of a son to Abraham from Sarah. "They are reckoned as seed." By a scribal fault it is read "they are estimated" instead of "they are judged" or "they are reckoned." It was not enough for Paul to distinguish in the thing itself, but also in reputation, so that from this he might have that all the Israelites who fall are not reckoned into the seed of Israel and Abraham; and thus, by their loss, nothing of the truth of God is lost. Therefore, the sons of Abraham and Israel are distinguished into sons of the flesh and sons of God, who are sons of the promise, who alone are reckoned as the seed of Abraham and Israel. This is what Paul intends and says. "For this is the word of the promise: 'At this time I will come, and Sarah shall have a son.'" He proves the sons of the promise from the words of the Lord in Genesis chapter 18.

¶ "And not only that." The word "that" is superfluous. Lest the divine election among the sons of Abraham be believed to be written only, he also asserts a divine election among the sons of Isaac, so that from these two testimonies it may be believed that which he intends to teach about divine election among the sons of Israel, of whom so great a part falls. Not only in Sarah's son did the divine promise appear. "But Rebecca also," the wife of Isaac. "Having from one bed"—the text is corrupted. For in the Greek text neither is the word "by intercourse" found, nor can that word be joined with "from one," because "one" is of the masculine gender and in the genitive case in place of the ablative, while the word rendered "by intercourse," which signifies a bed, is of the feminine gender and in the accusative case, and is governed by the

participle “having.” It must be read: “Having from one bed.” Yet it is not without ambiguity whether “Isaac” placed in the genitive is also in place of the ablative and is joined with “from one,” so that the text is, “having from one bed, from Isaac our father”; or whether it should be read, “having from one bed of Isaac our father.” If all those genitives are changed into the ablative, the plurality of births with respect to Rebecca’s sons is excluded, and the identity of father and mother with respect to the two sons is explained. But if “Isaac our father” is left in the genitive, the explanation better fits that one is chosen: so that not only from one son of Abraham (namely, the one Sarah bore to him), but also from one son whom Rebecca bore, having the bed of Isaac our father, the divine election is manifest. With an honorable word taken from the place (that is, the bed) he signified the marital act, so that we may learn to speak of sexual matters publicly with modesty. According to this sense, not only the father Isaac, but also one of the sons is signified as chosen. And the conjunction added afterward, saying, “For when they were not yet born,” fits this sense; for the reason why one son is chosen is clearly rendered. And he says this to exclude divination of future things from the hour of birth.

¶ “Or had done anything good or evil.” He added this to exclude the error both of those who posit a cycle of souls and of those who think souls are created before they are infused into bodies, and that in that prior state they did something good or evil. “That the purpose of God according to election might stand.” Before he brings forward the authority of Scripture, he renders the reason for it, which he explains further by adding: “Not from works” of the sons “but from him who calls,” namely God. “It was said to her,” namely to Rebecca, in Genesis chapter 25, “that the elder shall serve the younger.” This place does not need exposition, but application of the mind, to which Paul himself gave the reason. For from this authority Paul intends nothing other than that here it appears that not from our works but from the will of God choosing and calling, one is chosen and another rejected. And because this authority shows one to be preferred to the other, he adds another

CHAPTER NINE

authority testifying of the same that one is chosen and the other is held in hatred. "As it is written," in Malachi chapter 1, "Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated." Here note that "to hate" does not signify merely the privation of love, but signifies to will evil. And for that reason a hard question arises, how it is verified that God wills evil to someone not from his works. The solution is that God from eternity truly chooses some and rejects some, loves some and hates some, insofar as to some from eternity he wills to confer the help of his grace and to assist them all the way to eternal glory, but others he likewise from eternity wills to permit to themselves and not to assist them with the gratuitous help which he has decreed to confer upon the chosen. And this is for God to hate them, that is, for God to reject them, not from works. Yet with this it still stands that no one is damned except from his own works, and neither the sentence nor the execution of damnation takes place before such a rejected person sins. Nor can injustice be inferred in God from this eternal divine disposition, but supreme freedom, since he is held to neither; and from his pure freedom it depends that he wills to give gratuitous good to some, and wills not to give it to others, but to permit them in their natural state.

¶ "What then shall we say?" Paul foresees that question which we have touched upon, as something many would infer; and therefore he forestalls them by raising the same question. "Is there injustice with God?" For at first sight it appears that to will evil for one and good for another, without any diversity of merits, is injustice. "God forbid." It is the response of one who shudders. "For he says to Moses," in Exodus chapter 33, "I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will show mercy to whom I will show mercy." For the first verb signifies "I have compassion," but the second signifies "I show mercy." And the former properly sounds the affection of a heart that feels compassion; the latter is transferred to the conferral of a gratuitous effect, when something is conferred upon those constituted in some misery. And this authority is brought in so that the divine freedom both to have compassion and to show mercy may be made clear. For by saying "I will show mercy to whom I have compassion," he shows that he will give the effect of mercy

TO THE ROMANS

not to all but to those on whom he has compassion, that is, those whom he chooses from eternity to have compassion upon. And a similar sentence is about compassion itself, which does not befall God except metaphorically, as anger and the other passions. And it is put in God with respect to our evils; but the other is with respect to gratuitous goods according to the literal sense of Exodus, Scripture using the term “to have compassion” because of the poverty of words, although it is a word that is plainly of an affection of the soul. Therefore the whole response consists in manifesting the freedom of God, since it is clear that injustice has no place in the conferral and denial of purely gratuitous goods, according to the evangelical parable, “Is it not lawful for me to do what I will? Take what is yours.”

¶ “Therefore it is not of him who wills,” that is, not of internal works; “nor of him who runs,” that is, not of external works; “but of God who shows mercy,” supply, “is election,” that is, that a man is chosen.

¶ “For Scripture says to Pharaoh,” in Exodus chapter 9. For after Paul, by the authority of Scripture, has shown that there is no injustice in God in this, that he chooses some, he now consequently shows also by the authority of Scripture that there is no injustice in God in this, that he hates some, that is, rejects them. “For this very thing I have raised you up,” so that you may let my people go; that is, for this reason I raised you up through Moses and Aaron, that you may let my people go. “That I might show in you my power.” As though he had said more plainly: I did not raise you up so that you would let them go in fact (for I know you will not let them go), but I raised you up to the point of commanding you to let them go, that I might show my power in you through so many miracles and, at last, through the submersion of you and yours. “And that my name might be proclaimed in all the earth.” And so it came to pass. From this authority Paul has that the will of God is not unjust but good even in the intention and governance of the rejected, since he raises them up and orders them to the manifestation of his power and the glory of his name even though they are unwilling.

CHAPTER NINE

¶ “Therefore he has mercy on whom he wills, and whom he wills he hardens.” He concludes that the matter consists both in election and in rejection in the willing of God himself. And note that in both parts he posits a positive act of the divine will; and what he above named love and hatred, he now names will in both cases. And as has been declared, in both there concurs the divine will; but in election the divine will has as its object the man together with gratuitous help all the way to eternal glory; in rejection, however, it has as its object the man together with his being left to himself in his natural state. For in this object is included the denial of gratuitous help unto eternal life, and the permission of the fall is included. And therefore he says that he has mercy on whom he wills to have mercy, and likewise he hardens whom he wills to harden. But understand “to harden” as to leave the man to himself, so that the sense is: he leaves that man to himself whom he wills to leave to himself.

¶ “You will say to me then.” Paul raises another question that arises from what has been said. “Why then does he still complain?” This word is formed not from “you complain” but from “he complains.” Thus the sense is not, “Why is he still asked?” but “Why does he still complain?” and “God” is understood. And he says “still,” signifying the continuance of the divine complaint which he has continually exercised through the Prophets and the Apostles. For it is signified that there would remain no place for God to complain about the perdition of the rejected. And he adds the reason in the person of one disputing against God: “For who resists his will?” as though he said, no one. For from this, that God’s will is in rejection as well as in election, and from this, that no one has ever resisted his will (for the chosen proceeded according to God’s election, and the rejected proceeded according to rejection by fulfilling God’s will), it follows that God has no ground to complain about the perdition of the rejected. Here note that when it is said, “For who resists his will,” the pronoun “his” shows that in the preceding clause (“Why does he still complain?”) God is understood; otherwise he would have added, “the will of God,” but by adding the pronoun “his,” God is taken up again.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “O man.” One word is missing, which some render “indeed,” others “rather,” others “but.” And then he adds, “O man.” Paul refutes this question in two ways. First, by arguing from presumption: “Who are you who answer against God?” that is, who answer back against God. He says it is presumption that man not only answers but answers back against God. For words such as “Why does God still complain?” are nothing other than to answer back against God who chooses and rejects, as though one man answered another in opposition by inquiring into the cause of the complaint, arguing against what he wills.

¶ “Will the thing formed say to him who formed it, ‘Why have you made me thus?’” The word “itself” is superfluous. He proves the charge of presumption from the example of the potter’s work, so that we may understand that it is the same for man to demand from God the reason for his will as if a vessel should answer the potter, “Why have you made me thus?” For man is God’s handiwork. “Does not the potter have power over the clay, from the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?” Someone might say that if a vessel had reason it would say to the potter, “Why have you made me thus?” And therefore he adds the reason why this saying is presumptuous: the potter’s free power to make from the same clay one vessel for honorable uses (for example, for drinking), and another for dishonorable (for example, for dregs). For from this free power the potter is shown to be beyond reproof, and the vessel’s complaint is shown not to be founded on any right.

¶ “But if God...” Where he previously repressed the presumption of man daring in some way to impute to God a superfluous complaint, he answers the question by giving the reason on the part of the end, and by declaring the difference of the divine action on this side and on that. And first he makes clear the proximate end of rejection, saying, “Willing to show wrath.” The object of the divine willing is not described thus (that is, vindicatory justice), but “to show” it. This directly pertains to the glory of God among creatures and to the usefulness of creatures, to whom this ray of divine goodness is shown in deed, namely vindicatory justice. For

CHAPTER NINE

in this life it is not shown: both because it is not exercised by God in this life, since the punishments of the present time are not proportioned to sins; and because that little vengeance which sometimes happens in this life by God does not openly show itself to be the justice of God, but is attributed to other causes. But the vengeance on the rejected will show to all and each the vindictory justice of God. Hence now, because that justice is not shown, God is not glorified as avenger; but then he will be glorified as the just avenger.

¶ “And to make his power known.” This is another proximate end similar to the foregoing: namely, that God wills to make his power known in deed. Although God exercised his power by creating and by working miracles, and exercises it continually by preserving and governing the whole universe, yet the power of God is not evidently known to men; but when he will subject the rejected, rebellious against his precepts, to eternal punishments against their will, he will make his power evidently known to all, even to the unbelievers themselves. And this knowledge is useful to creatures and is for the glory of God in creatures; for then God will be glorified as powerful.

¶ “He endured with much patience.” Note the words, for from them the solution of the question depends, and from them the reason for the divine complaint is made clear; for it is signified that the sins which the rejected commit, by reason of which the vengeance and power of God must be exercised and manifestly shown, are not willed by God. He does not say that for these ends he willed or made vessels of wrath, but he says “he endured”; for what we will, we do not endure patiently, but approve. And he signifies far more than that God does not will those things: for he signifies that he endured, that he permitted them to sin, and not in any way whatever, but “with much patience,” not at once destroying them as they deserve—something that is of grace, so that men of changeable will might have time to change their will away from committing crimes.

¶ “Vessels of wrath.” By alluding to the likeness of different vessels of the potter he calls them vessels of wrath. And truly the rejected are

TO THE ROMANS

vessels of wrath: for they are containments, in themselves, of the vindictory justice of God, since it will be placed in them as water in a vessel. God endures such vessels patiently in this life. “Fitted for destruction.” He does not say, “which God fitted for destruction,” but says “fitted for destruction,” so that we may understand that they are vessels of wrath from the same source from which they are fitted for destruction—without doubt, of eternal death. But it is established that by their own sins, by their own merits, which God does not will but endures patiently, the rejected are vessels of vengeance; for God is not an avenger before the man is a sinner. And consequently, from themselves the rejected are vessels fitted by their own merits for eternal destruction.

¶ “And that he might show the riches of his glory.” The copulative conjunction is missing. It must be read, “And that he might show the riches of his glory.” After the proximate ends of rejection and the divine patience toward the rejected, he adds the proximate end of election, likewise consisting in “showing.” But where in the rejected some determinate thing is shown, in the chosen, by “riches,” a multitude and abundance of goods pertaining to the glory of God prepared for the chosen are signified. “On vessels of mercy,” without doubt divine, as the rejected are vessels of wrath. “Which he prepared for glory.” See the difference. Everything that belongs to the chosen is attributed to God: he himself is the preparer of glory; he himself is the preparer of the vessels for glory. But in the rejected, something is ascribed to God—namely, to will to show wrath and power and to endure patiently; and something is not to God but to them—namely, to do the things to be endured, by which they are vessels of wrath and are fitted for destruction.

¶ Note, learned reader, that the whole of this clause (“But if God, willing...” and so forth) appears defective and requires something to be understood that refutes the one answering back to God, as though: your objection is vain. For from these things duly weighed it becomes clear that it is false that the rejected do the things pleasing to the divine will, on which the objection was founded; and therefore God, through the Prophets and the Apostles, rightly complains continually of the injuries

CHAPTER NINE

inflicted upon him by sinners, as those doing what God does not will; and yet with all these things God disposes all things to good ends.

¶ Before proceeding to the rest, it meets the continual curiosity of men to respond about predestination and rejection. For they say: if I am of the number of the chosen, at last it will be so in fact that I will be saved; and likewise, if I am of the number of the rejected, at last it will be so that I will be damned. And when the responses of theologians are removed, they add: it is not my concern whether this will happen necessarily or contingently; it is enough for me that it will be so, in whatever manner it will be. And therefore no distinction about the sense compounded or divided, or about the necessity of the consequence or of the consequent, pertains to this curiosity. I do not care, as I said, whether necessarily or contingently; but as I propose, I wish to know whether what I propose is true.

¶ I answer that we can speak in this curious question in two ways: either beginning from those things which stand on God's side and descending to us, or conversely beginning from those things which stand on our side and ascending to God. If we begin from God, we profess first that God from eternity chose this man and that man in particular, because it so pleased him; second, that the election of this man will infallibly (I do not say necessarily, but that at last) have its effect, namely, the salvation of this man. But beginning from us, we profess first that each man has free choice to choose good and evil; second, that each man doing what is in him toward attaining eternal salvation will be saved through divine grace. But by what manner, or by what bond, by what glue, ascent and descent are joined does not appear. For in ascending there fails the step that joins our liberty and our security (that by doing what is in us divine grace will not fail, saving) with the eternity and immutability of the divine election, which has that only the chosen are saved. And likewise in descending from the eternal, immutable, and efficacious divine election there fails the step that joins it with our liberties and securities. And therefore it is not surprising if we do not quiet the intellect of those who inquire and introduce incongruities,

TO THE ROMANS

namely, “let each do what he wills; at last the election will be fulfilled,” and similar dreadful things.

¶ Therefore, to the curiosity I say that those things are true on the side of divine election or rejection, but they are not true alone, but associated with other truths on our side: namely, that we have free choice; that by doing what is in us we will be saved through divine grace; and that we adults are saved or damned by our merits. And when you object, “Join these truths together,” I will respond that I know that truth is not contrary to truth, but I do not know how to join these; just as I do not know the mystery of the Trinity, just as I do not know the immortal soul, just as I do not know “the Word was made flesh,” and the like, which nevertheless I believe. And as I believe the other mysteries of faith, so I believe these mysteries of predestination and rejection. It is mine to hold what is certain for me (namely, to use free choice and the other goods granted to me by God with every effort to attain eternal life) and to wait to see in the homeland the mystery of divine election now unknown to me, just as the other mysteries of faith. This ignorance quiets my intellect.

¶ “Whom he also called”—“us” is missing. He explains the vessels of mercy by numbering himself among others. “Not only from the Jews, but also from the Gentiles.” He signified unity by the pronoun “us” among the chosen and called from both nations, to teach that those called both from Gentiles and from Jews are sons of the promise, sons of God, those who are reckoned in the seed of Abraham and Israel.

¶ “As he says in Hosea,” in about the first and second chapters: “I will call ‘not my people’ ‘my people,’ and ‘not beloved’ ‘beloved.’” This authority is brought forward for the chosen from the Gentiles, by which it is signified that the people of the Gentiles, who was not the people of God according to worship, nor beloved for gifts of grace, will be called the people of God and beloved by God, as experience testifies. “And her who had not obtained mercy, her who had obtained mercy.” This whole clause is superfluous. It was perhaps added by someone who read this clause in Hosea and did not notice that Paul had said instead, “and ‘not beloved’ ‘beloved.’”

CHAPTER NINE

¶ “And it shall be.” Paul continues the words of Hosea, and punctuation must be made there: “and it shall be,” signifying, “it shall be that which I will add.” “In the place where it was said to them, ‘You are not my people,’ there they shall be called sons of the living God.” Not only is the change of the Gentiles from “not the people of God” to “the people of God,” from “not beloved” to “beloved,” foretold, but also the identity of place is foretold, so that without local transference those Gentiles in their own places will be changed into sons of God. And the Prophet said this for the distinction from the Jews, who in a determinate place (namely, in Jerusalem, in the land of promise only) had the integrity of divine worship and legal observance. As though he had said more plainly: without their migrating into Judea, without their coming to Jerusalem, the Gentiles in their own places will be the people of God, beloved by God, sons of the living God. And this sentence is the same as that which the Lord said to the Samaritan woman: “The hour is coming when neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father... God is spirit...” and the like.

¶ “But Isaiah cries out concerning Israel,” in Isaiah chapter 10. He had said, “from Jews and Gentiles,” and after he declared from Scripture that part “from the Gentiles,” he declares from Scripture also that part “from the Jews,” and he brings in Isaiah crying out with a cry of groaning, or of sorrow, over the fewness of the chosen from the Jews. “Though the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of the sea, the remnant shall be saved.” The conjunction “though” is not taken conditionally but adversatively. And the sense is: however great the number of the sons of Israel is, as the sand of the sea, the remnant shall be saved; that is, so few will be saved that they are commonly like remnants, which are few. For by the name “remnants” we are accustomed to call what is left over, as though fragments. He intends, in the literal sense, to signify the fewness of those chosen to faith in Christ from Israel, although the people of Israel would be innumerable as the sand of the sea.

¶ “For a word...” Paul continues the authority of Isaiah. Here note not an error but an obscurity of the Latin text, because the translator

TO THE ROMANS

used the word “word,” which is of the neuter gender and has the same nominative as accusative. He could have removed this obscurity by saying “speech,” since “word” is in the accusative case. “Completing and shortening”: both are in the nominative case, and it signifies God perfecting and cutting short the speech. For the Greek word rendered “shortening” properly signifies “cutting off,” and it is transferred to “shortening,” because by cutting off there is shortening. “In justice.” The reason for the remnants is added from this, that God, with justice requiring it, cuts off and perfects his word. For the abandonment of the innumerable people of Israel, saving so few from them, is a cutting off proceeding from the justice of their merits who are abandoned, and it is the fulfillment of the divine word concerning his justice. “For the Lord will make a shortened word upon the earth,” that is, because the Lord will accomplish upon the earth a cut-short speech, and thus a shortened one, in the salvation of the few by his grace. And thus the reason for the salvation of the remnant is rendered after the reason for the abandonment of so great a multitude has been rendered.

¶ “And as Isaiah foretold,” in Isaiah chapter 1: “Unless the Lord Sabaoth...” Paul uses a Hebrew word, and it signifies “of hosts,” not as “virtue” is the name of a moral habit, but of supreme power. “Had left us a seed.” Divine grace is commended in this, that it saved even a few. “We would have become like Sodom, and would have been made like Gomorrah.” By this the merits of the Jews are signified as similar to the merits of Sodom and Gomorrah, to commend divine grace gratuitously leaving a seed, gratuitously saving some. Although this too can be referred to the divine preservation of the innumerable people left behind, insofar as it was not destroyed in this life as the Sodomites and Gomorrheans were destroyed. For a seed was left, not from their merits but from divine grace, so that at some time (namely, at the end of the world) it might bear fruit for Christ.

¶ “What then?” By asking he intends to conclude. And the sense is: what then do you wish to infer from the things brought forward? And he immediately adds the answer: “We say that the Gentiles...” and the rest.

CHAPTER NINE

¶ Note again, learned reader, that I therefore said that the text appears (I did not say that it is) defective from the clause “But if God, willing...” because there are not lacking those who say perspicaciously that the text depends from that place up to these words “What then?” so that the order of the text is: “But if God, willing to show...” and so forth, “what then,” supply, “can be said against him?” For it appears from the things said that the argument is refuted and that God chooses and rejects reasonably. And then it is added what we understand to be the reason on the part of the Gentiles and Israel, saying: “We say that the Gentiles, who did not pursue justice,” as being without the worship of God and without the law, “have attained justice,” and by declaring what sort, he adds, “the justice which is from faith.” The interpreter added “is.” What the justice from faith is has been explained above: for it is the justice of Christ, communicated to us through faith. For by this we are justified, and the Gentiles attained it by believing. “But Israel, pursuing a law of justice,” which is the law of Moses, which commands justice, both in what pertains to God in the first three precepts, and in what pertains to men in the remaining precepts, “did not attain to the law of justice.” Here note two things. First, that the discourse is about the innumerable multitude of the people of Israel; of this it is said that it did not attain to the law of justice. Second, that Paul uses a metaphor of those running toward some goal, to which one forestalls another; and he introduces the Gentiles as running without pursuing the precepts of justice, and yet attaining the justice of faith; but the Israelites as running by observing the precepts of the law, and yet not forestalling the Gentiles, although it appears that they ought to have forestalled them, as being more prepared by the precepts of the law. And he says “did not attain,” so that we may understand that the people of Israel will at some time, though late, attain, namely when the fullness of the Gentiles has entered, by whom it was forestalled.

¶ Moreover, what he says, “to the law of justice,” can be explained in two ways: either by understanding by “the law of justice” the justice which is from faith, or (which fits Paul’s words better) it is understood as

TO THE ROMANS

the full fulfillment of the law of Moses, concerning which, in the preceding chapter, he said, “that the justification of the law might be fulfilled in us.” And the sense is that Israel, pursuing the law of the precepts of justice, did not forestall the Gentiles unto the full observance of the precepts of justice. And this is true, because they have not yet attained such full observance, as was shown above. But the Gentiles, by means of faith, have attained full observance of the law of justice. Thus the Gentiles not only attained the justice of Christ, but also forestalled unto the full observance of the law of justice. Nor is the end toward which the Gentiles and toward which Israel tend thereby changed, since these two (namely, justice from faith and full observance of the law) mutually imply one another, as is clear in the preceding chapter; for the justification of the law cannot be fulfilled otherwise than through the justice of faith, through the law of the Spirit of life in Christ. But Paul, deliberately preserving the identity of the end according to the thing, described one and the same end under diverse aspects, corresponding to each according to its own perspective and intention: the Gentiles indeed directly tend to the justice of Christ, but the Jews directly tend to the full observance of the law.

¶ “Why?” He asks the cause of this disparity. “Because not from faith.” He renders the reason for the disparity, first from the root, saying that the Israelites went not from faith, “but as though from works”—“of the law” is missing. The radical reason for the disparity is that the Israelites did not found the step of their soul upon faith, but advanced as though founding their path upon the works of the law. And he added “as though,” to signify the disposition of the Jews without excluding faith from their minds. For as we see proud Christians, without loss of faith, act as though confident in themselves by reason of their disposition toward themselves, so Paul describes the Israelites: although they had faith in the one true God and the like, nevertheless they founded their disposition not on the side of faith but on the side of works of the law, whereas the principal foundation ought to have been faith.

CHAPTER NINE

¶ “For they stumbled on the stone of stumbling.” He manifests the disparity from the very progress; for he has already said that he speaks according to the metaphor of those traveling. And therefore he now brings forward what followed in the journey from the aforesaid root, openly showing the reason for their not attaining, because they struck in the path against the stone of stumbling, which is Christ. And truly they struck to their own ruin, since, when Christ came before them, by an act of unbelief they struck against him.

¶ “As it is written.” He brings forward the testimony of Scripture from Isaiah. Here note that both the first and the last part of the appended sentence is taken from Isaiah chapter 28, about the middle, but the middle part is taken from Isaiah chapter 8. Nor are the words taken in every respect, but partly the words and partly the sense. “Behold, I place in Zion a stone.” This is the first part, and God speaks of Christ: “Behold, I lay a stone in Zion; behold, I place a foundational stone in Zion.” For Christ in the literal sense drew his origin in Judea and from the Jews; he preached everywhere only there; and he was crucified and rose again in Jerusalem. “Of stumbling, and a rock of scandal.” This is the middle part. In the Hebrew it is said to have “a stone of striking,” in place of what we have “of stumbling.” But this matters little. For Christ is a stone of stumbling and of striking and of scandal: for he is one against whom one can strike and against whom one does strike, and by whom the one striking is struck. All these things we see fulfilled in the Jews, struck with blindness and hardening, because by a motion of unbelief they struck against Christ.

¶ “And everyone who believes in him shall not be confounded.” This last part Paul deliberately did not bring forward according to the words but according to the sense, so that he might set forth the sense of the prophecy. For in Isaiah it is written, “He who believes does not hasten so as to see this.” Paul explains it as “shall not be ashamed,” so that we may understand the Prophet to signify the same thing under the metaphor of one hastening to see. For by warning that the believer does not hasten to see, he removes fear of confusion or shame. For the one

TO THE ROMANS

who hastens to see what he believes is anxious lest perhaps it be otherwise, and fears being afflicted with shame. And therefore the Prophet, warning that the believer does not hasten to see this, makes him secure that he will not be ashamed in believing and waiting. Therefore, to free us from the labor of understanding the Prophet, Paul set down not the words but the sense. And from this he has that Christ is so truly for unbelievers the stone of stumbling and the rock of scandal that nevertheless for believers in him he is salvation believed and awaited, such that no one believing in him will blush for his expectation.

CHAPTER TEN

CHAPTER X

¶ “Brothers, the desire indeed of my heart ...” When he had declared the Gospel to be unto salvation for Jews and Gentiles (though with few chosen from the Jews and many from the Gentiles), and when on the side of the Gentiles and the Jews he had rendered a certain reason—namely, that the Gentiles have advanced from faith, but the Jews as though from the works of the Law—he now pursues this reason in the case of the Jews: showing that they have ignorance annexed, though not excusing. For this is what he renders in this chapter, drawing out the explanation of that clause proposed at the beginning: “The just man shall live by faith.” And rightly so, because the “reason” of the Jews rests upon justice. Yet, when he adduces the ignorance of the Jews, he most modestly asserts it as a reason for praying for them. For prayers of others are useful for those who sin out of ignorance; hence the Lord also prayed: “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.”

¶ To this end, addressing the Roman Church (constituted of Jews and Gentiles), he explains to them two dispositions of Paul himself toward the Jews who have not been converted to Christ. The first disposition is the desire of his heart, that is, a ready inclination of soul toward their salvation. “And my supplication to God is for them. For Israel—my prayer and entreaty to God for Israel—is unto salvation.” The second disposition is that he pours out prayers for Israel not as despairing, but as salutary. For from this he enters upon setting forth their ignorance. “For I bear them witness.”

¶ He renders the reason why prayers for Israel are unto salvation. “That they have a zeal indeed for God.” This word is superfluous. And this zeal is indeed praiseworthy. “But not according to knowledge,” that is, according to understanding. This is: they have zeal for God, but not regulated by the necessary knowledge. And this is the ignorance of the Jews. “For, being ignorant of the justice of God and of their own ...”

TO THE ROMANS

Something is lacking. “Seeking to establish justice, they have not been subject,” that is, “they were not subject,” “to the justice of God.”

¶ Paul divides justice into the justice of God and the justice of the Law; and the latter he calls the proper justice of the Jews. And he says that the Jews are ignorant of the justice of God and strive to establish the justice of the Law. And lest the reader be enveloped in obscurity of terms, let him recall what was said above: that the justice of God is the justice of satisfaction rendered to God for the human race by the death of Christ. And this is called the justice from faith, or the justice of faith. But the justice of the Law is the very observance of the precepts of the Law—judicial, ceremonial, and moral. This justice of God, which Christ alone exercised, the unbelieving Jews did not know; and by following the Law of Moses they seek to establish the justice of the precepts of the Law as sufficient for salvation without the justice of God accomplished through Christ. This is the sense that must be kept before the eyes in this matter. And therefore it is said of them that “they were not subject to the justice of God,” that is: they were unwilling to be subjected. For one is subjected to the justice of God by believing in Christ, and in no other way.

¶ “For the end of the Law is Christ, unto justice to everyone that believes.” Lest we should understand these two justices as disparate, and as though set apart or contrived without testimony of the Scriptures, he adds an order. Or rather, he proves from the order of final cause between these justices that clause last stated, namely, “they were not subject to the justice of God.” For such an order is signified by saying that Christ is the end of the Law—not in any way, but unto communicating justice to everyone that believes. And indeed, that Christ is the end of the Law even the unbelieving Jews confess, since they say that the Prophets prophesied up to the Messiah. But that the Messiah, by his own justice, saves all who believe, perhaps the unbelieving Jews deny; but Paul has made this manifest above. And by this—that Christ is the end to which the Law is ordered, so that every believer may attain justice—it is proved that the Jews were not subject to the justice of God. For, by rejecting the

CHAPTER TEN

end of the Law, Christ, they rejected the justice of God. These things Paul, in his manner, has proposed, intending to declare them individually.

¶ “For Moses wrote,” that is, “writes,” in Leviticus chapter 18. At the same time he sets forth the two justices and their order by the authority of Moses. “For the justice that is of the Law ...” These are Paul’s words, not Moses’s. For he prefaces that the words of Moses added afterward describe the justice that is of the Law. “He that shall do ...” A conjunction “that” is lacking. It must be read: “That the man who shall do these things shall live in them,” and not “in it.” And the sense is that the one who acts according to the precepts of the Law shall live in them: that is, he shall have temporal life. For in contrast to the future life it is said “in them.” And this is what Paul intends to have from this authority: namely, that the justice of the Law bestows the present life, insofar as it bestows living in the precepts of the Law.

¶ Yet it is understood more incisively as “he shall live in them,” that is, according to their merits, in contrast to life simply and absolutely. And this fits Paul more directly, according to what was said above—that “the doers of the Law shall be justified,” not simply, but insofar as it is from works. But “the justice that is of faith speaks thus.”

¶ Note that Paul does not introduce Moses as saying the things that follow, taken from Deuteronomy chapter 30; rather, he introduces the justice that is of faith as speaking—not without mystery. For he knew that those words are said openly in the person of Moses; but because he most acutely saw that they were said by reason of the justice of faith, therefore he introduced the justice of faith as saying the things said on its behalf. That you may penetrate this, consider more diligently the text of Deuteronomy, and you will perceive that when Moses had put into writing the Law containing so many precepts (moral, ceremonial, and judicial), he foretold to the people that if it should depart from God it would be scattered throughout the world; and that, wherever it should be scattered throughout the world, if from the whole heart it should return to God, God would bring them back from captivity, dispersion, and the rest.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ And speaking of this conversion of mind to God from the whole heart and whole soul by loving him, he says these things which Paul cites. Here the keen reader can see that, in contrast to the justice of the Law, Moses wrote these things about the justice of an interior conversion to God; and that the former (namely, the justice of the Law) depends on this and is ordered to this, he sufficiently indicates by writing its consequence from this—namely, that when one has been converted to God, he will keep the ceremonies and judgments and the rest. And he brought this out to such a degree that he foretold that they would be inexcusable in this, wherever they might be. For Moses intends in the letter that although, scattered throughout the world, they can excuse themselves from the justice of the written Law because they would lack it, nevertheless they cannot excuse themselves from the justice that is from an interior conversion to God; because this is not distant by place, but is near to each one in his heart and in his mouth. Nor is it doubtful that this is the end of the whole written Law; and therefore it was so greatly weighed by Moses.

¶ If you add to these things Paul's distinction between the justice of the Law and the justice of God, which is from faith, you will see that Moses, in the letter, speaks of the justice from faith, of the justice which Paul calls God's. And if you proceed further and consider that the justice from faith, even before the times of Moses, was at least implicitly the justice from faith in Christ (for no one was ever saved without faith in Christ, explicitly or implicitly), you will see that Paul does not depart from the path when he explains that the justice spoken by Moses is the justice from faith which the Apostles preach, applying it to Christ. If you keep this distinction before your eyes, you will have a clear understanding of diverse Scriptures about the justice of those who keep the Law. For sometimes Scripture speaks of the Law in itself alone, and thus it is said of it both that no one was ever justified from the works of the Law, and that "he who has done the precepts of the Law shall live in them," and many similar things of imperfection. But sometimes the discourse is of the Law joined to the interior justice of faith, and thus it is said of it: "If

CHAPTER TEN

you wish to enter into life, keep the commandments,” and similar words that promise eternal life to those who keep the Law.

¶ “Say not in your heart.” A negative precept, as it were, brought in from the justice of faith, is introduced, bearing upon the heart, in which the seat of the justice of faith is. “Who shall ascend into heaven?” In Deuteronomy, a refuge judged necessary indeed but impossible is forbidden; but Paul speaks of it as a forbidden refuge that is unbelievable, explaining it of Christ, when he adds: “That is, to bring Christ down.” And the sense is: Who shall ascend into heaven to bring down the Messiah? This is to doubt, or to judge impossible, that God becomes man; for this is to ascend to bring Christ down.

¶ “Or who shall descend into the abyss?” that is, “to bring Christ back from the dead.” This is to doubt, or to judge impossible, the resurrection of Christ from the dead. Thus, in these two, the mystery of the Incarnation of the Word and the Resurrection of Christ (in which the rest of faith is comprehended) is denied. And because Paul drew this from Deuteronomy according to the mystical sense, therefore he does not introduce Moses as speaking. Nor should you wonder that Paul brings in “Who shall descend into the abyss,” when in Deuteronomy it is read, “Who shall cross the sea”; for what the Hebrews call crossing the sea, they call descending into the abyss, that is, into deep waters, as in the saying: “They that go down to the sea in ships ...”

¶ “But what does it say?” The word “Scripture” is superfluous. Since the first statement was negative, he adds, “But what does it say,” as though he said, “But what does it affirm?” “Near.” “You” is lacking: “The word is in your mouth and in your heart.” These are the words of Deuteronomy about the word of interior conversion to God. “Near to you”: ready at hand; wherever you are, it is with you. There is no need of books or any migration—there is a word to be believed in the heart and confessed with the mouth. “This is the word of faith which we preach.” This which Deuteronomy speaks of, says Paul, is the word of faith which we, the Apostles of Christ, preach; we preach nothing new, but that same

TO THE ROMANS

word which Moses so greatly commended, which is found everywhere and near to all.

¶ “For if you confess ...” He declares those words of Deuteronomy, “in your mouth and in your heart,” as to the matter then implicitly signified. “With your mouth: the Lord Jesus.” By two names he signifies the whole mystery of the Incarnation. By saying “Lord,” he signifies the divinity; by saying “Jesus,” he signifies the humanity. It is as though he said: if you confess true God—Jesus, true man. “And if you believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead.” He comprehends in these words the mystery of the death, resurrection, and glory of Christ. “You shall be saved.” Of the justice of the Law it was said, “he shall live in them”; of the justice of faith it is said, “you shall be saved,” so that we may understand that eternal salvation is given through this, whereas through that the present life is given. And by this the statement is made clear: “The just man shall live by faith.”

¶ “For with the heart one believes unto justice.” He declares the same words (“in the mouth and in the heart”) on the side of necessity, explaining that it is necessary to believe with the heart in order to have the justice which is called the justice of God and the justice of faith. And believing is attributed to the heart, both to exclude the pretense of those who feign that they believe, and to signify that the will commands the believing that confers justice. And this is in contrast to forced faith, such as is in demons, who, compelled by the evidence of facts, believe the mysteries of faith—but not unto justice. “But with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.” The necessity of confessing the truth believed, even in spoken speech, is explained as a necessity for salvation. For when it is necessary to speak in order to preserve salvation, then it is necessary to confess with the mouth; otherwise: “Whoever shall be ashamed of me before men, of him the Son of Man shall be ashamed before the angels of God.”

¶ “For Scripture says,” Isaiah chapter 28, also brought in above: “Everyone who believes in him shall not be confounded,” that is, “shall not be ashamed.” And he repeats this to explain what he had assumed,

CHAPTER TEN

that if you believe you shall be saved. For the future salvation of the believer is explained by saying that everyone who believes shall not be ashamed. “For there is no distinction of Jew and Greek,” that is, of Jew and Greek, that is, of Gentile. He pursues the explanation of that clause, “everyone.” And he does this to explain what he had proposed above, namely, “unto justice to everyone that believes.” For he had already declared both the two justices and their order, together with the necessity of the justice of God. Therefore he now treats the universality, saying that there is no distinction of Jew and Gentile as to the fruit of faith, that is, as to justice and salvation to be had from faith. For although, as to many privileges, there is distinction between Jew and Gentile, nevertheless, as to the fruit of faith, there is no distinction of Jew and Gentile.

¶ And he proves this: “For the same Lord of all is rich unto all who call upon him.” In this reason there is touched both the identity of the Lord of Jews and Gentiles, and the abundance of the riches of that Lord toward all who call upon him. For both conditions are required: since however much one abounds in riches, he nevertheless has care sufficient for those subject to him; and likewise, however much one is the same lord, he is excused if he does not abound in riches so as to be able to pour them out upon all his subjects. With both conditions therefore joined, it is proved that there is no distinction concerning the fruits of faith on God’s part.

¶ “For everyone who shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.” Whereas previously, by the authority of Scripture, he had declared the salvation of the believer, now consequently he declares the salvation of the confessor. And therefore he passes from believers to those who call upon him: for invocation is a species of confession. And he adduces the authority of Joel chapter 2 concerning those who call upon him: for these words, “everyone who shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved,” are written in Joel chapter 2.

¶ “How then shall they call upon him ...?” Having treated that authority of Deuteronomy as to the clauses “in your mouth and in your heart,” he now treats it consequently as to that clause “near to you,” at the

TO THE ROMANS

same time declaring what Paul himself had added, namely, “which we preach.” For he declares the necessity of Apostolic preaching, by which the word of faith is near to each one. And he declares the necessity of preaching by beginning from the last—namely, from the confession of the mouth under the name of invocation—saying: “How then shall they call upon him in whom they have not believed?” For invocation presupposes faith. “And how shall they believe him whom they have not heard?” According to the common course, believing presupposes bodily hearing, although God sometimes teaches inwardly without external hearing, as he taught Paul. “And how shall they hear without a preacher?” Hence it is clear that the discourse is of exterior hearing, as also of preaching. “And how shall they preach unless they are sent?” Supply: by God. For to preach the things that are God’s, which are of divine counsel, no one rightly attempts unless he is sent by God—just as no one, unless sent by a king, without rashness can proclaim the counsel of a kingdom.

¶ “As it is written.” He adduces to this last point the authority of Isaiah chapter 52: “How beautiful are the feet of those who evangelize peace, who evangelize good things.” From the beauty, that is, the loveliness of the feet, he declares that they are sent. For whether affections or progress be signified by the feet, from this very fact that they are beautiful they have every proportion and form of right reason; and it is manifest that they would lack this unless they were sent. Hence, all who have presumed or presume to evangelize are at length found false, as Christ also said to the Apostles: “As the Father has sent me, I also send you.” By “peace” and “good things” the whole evangelical matter is signified, as it is easy to apply.

¶ “But not all obey,” that is, “obeyed,” “the Gospel.” He adds this so that he may infer the explanation of the clause proposed, namely, “they were not subject to the justice of God.” For this is what he now explains: that not all obeyed the Gospel. For although by evangelical preachers the word of faith is near to each one, nevertheless not all obeyed the Gospel. And he says “obeyed,” because to believe in Christ is a certain obedience

CHAPTER TEN

of the intellect commanded by a will affected toward peace and evangelical goods.

¶ “For Isaiah says,” Isaiah chapter 53: “Lord, who has believed our report?” Although in Isaiah the word “Lord” is not found, yet because the Septuagint added this word, Paul, secure in the interpretation of the Septuagint, brought it forward: “Lord, who has believed our report?” And the sense is: Lord, who has believed the things heard from us speaking? For Isaiah calls “our hearing,” that is, the hearing of the prophets, the hearing of the people from the mouth of the prophets. Yet even the pronoun “our” can show both God and the prophet: and thus the hearing of the people from the mouth of Isaiah, on God’s side, is called “our hearing.” And it is said “who has believed,” not as though he says “no one,” but as though he says “few of the Jews.”

¶ “Therefore faith is from hearing.” Hence it clearly appears that it is not of Isaiah’s passive hearing (by which, namely, he heard from God), but of the passive hearing of the people (by which the people heard from Isaiah) that he said: “Who has believed our report?” For it is clear that faith arises from the people’s hearing from the prophets. And here note that faith, as it is said to the Ephesians chapter 2, is the gift of God, and not of the creature, as to the will to believe and as to the very believing in God. Yet as to the determinate explication of those things that are to be believed, faith is from hearing; for by hearing evangelical doctrine we learn what things, determinately, we must believe. Hence also Cornelius the centurion, already believing in God by the gift of faith, sent for Peter, and from him learned the things that were determinately to be believed by him, as is clear in the Acts of the Apostles; and it is the same with similar cases.

¶ “But hearing is by the word of Christ,” that is, “of God.” The hearing of the people is derived from the word of God revealed to the Prophets and the Apostles, so that, from beginning to end, faith may be understood to proceed from God’s word, not from men’s, as to the determination of things to be believed. Thus faith in both ways is from God. Hence by no human authority can new things to be believed be

TO THE ROMANS

introduced; but only those things can be explained which have been revealed by the word of God to the Apostles and the Prophets.

¶ “But I say, have they not heard?” Lest an excuse should be brought forward by saying that the word of faith is not near to all, he adds that the hearing of Apostolic preaching has extended to the whole world. And for this he uses the words of a Psalm, adding: “And indeed, their sound went out into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.” When he says “into all the earth,” understand “into every region of the earth”; and it is not necessary to constrain this text to individual lands. And similarly, when he says “unto the ends of the world,” understand it of the ends of our inhabited quarter of the earth, taking “ends” broadly as the extremities of regions. And I would say this using this authority with reference to Paul’s time—though it is not necessary. It suffices that it be so in the course of time; for thus it suffices to understand that the word of faith is near to each one, which Paul intends.

¶ Nor does the authority of the Psalm impede this, since in the letter it does not speak of the preaching of the Apostles but of the corporeal heavens; nor in the Hebrew is it “sound” but “line” or “rule.” Yet because the Apostles are spiritual heavens, Paul, using the mystical sense, applied this to the Apostles, using the common Greek text; and therefore he said “their sound.”

¶ “But I say, did Israel not know?” After he had fully treated the words of Deuteronomy to declare the reason of the Jews’ case, he now returns to pursue the inexcuseableness of the case. For he had said that they fell through ignorance; but lest that ignorance should be understood as excusing, he now adds that their ignorance does not excuse, because they had ready at hand what would enable them to know. For they had the words of the Prophets, from which they could know that what was evangelized by the Apostles was true. Therefore when he says, “Did Israel not know?”, it is: could it not know?

¶ “First Moses says.” First in time among the writers of Sacred Scripture; first in authority among the prophets, according to the word at

CHAPTER TEN

the end of Deuteronomy: "And there arose no more a prophet in Israel like Moses," and the rest. "I will bring you to jealousy," that is, "I will provoke," "by a non-nation," that is, "by a non-people." These words are taken from Deuteronomy chapter 32, where we have: "I will provoke them by that which is not a people, and in a foolish nation I will anger them." And the sense is that I, God, will confer so great good upon a non-nation, that is, upon the Gentiles, that I will provoke the Israelites to envy. And similarly what follows: "In a senseless nation I will send you into wrath," that is, "and in a foolish nation I will anger you." For wrath is born from envy. And therefore it is added: I will stir you to wrath by the greatness of the good that I will confer upon the foolish nation.

¶ The Gentiles are called both "a non-nation" and "a foolish nation," because they lived without divine Law; for from this also they fell into perverse judgment about the things that are according to God (which is folly), and they lost the dignity of the human race according to the use of right reason, for which they are called "not a nation." But God is said to provoke to envy and stir to wrath, not by exciting to sin, but by bestowing upon the Gentiles goods from which the Jews can take occasion for envy and wrath. By this authority Paul intends that these two were foretold by Moses: both the exaltation of the Gentiles and the fall of the Jews. When therefore the Jews saw both fulfilled, they could recognize the prophecy as fulfilled.

¶ "But Isaiah is bold and says," Isaiah chapter 65, that is, he boldly says in the person of God. "I was found by those who did not seek me." This is predicted of the Gentiles; and Gentiles are called those who did not seek God by worship and justice, in contrast to the Jews seeking God by divine worship and the justice of the Law. "I appeared openly," that is, "I was made manifest, to those who did not ask after me." He describes the magnitude of grace conferred on the Gentiles: being found by those who did not seek, being made manifest to those who did not inquire, so that all may be ascribed to divine grace, and the condition of the Gentiles before receiving faith in Christ may be set forth in diverse ways by Moses and Isaiah.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “But to Israel he says,” Isaiah chapter 65. As to the sense of the words, what he says to Israel is taken as against, for he says these things that follow against Israel, although the direction of the discourse is toward Israel’s rebuke. “All the day,” that is, the whole time. “I have stretched forth my hands,” conferring benefits so many and so great and so excellent. “To a people that does not believe,” that is, to an unbelieving people. The people Israel is called an unbelieving people, as experience testifies. “But,” that is, “and,” “contradicting me.” “To me” is superfluous. Israel is not only unbelieving in the Messiah, but contradicts and impugns as much as it can the divine truth concerning Jesus Christ sent for the salvation of the world.

¶ By these Scriptures Paul intends to make manifest that the Jews could have known both the salvation of the Gentiles and their own ruin, which they see to have followed upon the coming of Jesus Christ, to have been prophesied in the sacred Prophets. Thus, besides evangelical preaching, they have the Scriptures as witnesses, from which their ignorance is rendered not excusing them.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

CHAPTER XI

¶ “Therefore I say.” He pursues the case of Israel on God’s side. For after he described it on the side of the Jews themselves, he now pursues the same on God’s side, declaring that from divine grace the whole people of Israel has not been rejected. And he introduces this by way of question, adding: “Has God rejected his people?” Supply: the whole. “God forbid.” This is the response of one who recoils.

¶ “For I also ...” He proves the answer in three ways. First, from himself as not rejected. “I am an Israelite,” by race. “Of the seed of Abraham.” This he added to explain that he is an Israelite not as a proselyte but by natural stock. “Of the tribe of Benjamin,” to certify his lineage more.

¶ “God has not rejected his people whom he foreknew,” that is, “whom he knew beforehand.” Lest it should be objected that one swallow does not make spring, he proves it secondly by a reason: because God foreknew his people Israel. Here you clearly see Paul using “knowledge” as the name for the knowledge of approval. For the sense is that God did not reject the people because he foreknew it with approving knowledge; because once he approved it, therefore he did not reject it utterly.

¶ “Do you not know in Elijah what Scripture says?” He proves it thirdly from the example of a multitude, recounting the history written in the Third Book of Kings chapter 19, sufficiently clear. “How he intercedes,” that is, “speaks,” or “petitions,” “to God against Israel: Lord, they have killed your prophets, they have dug down your altars; and I alone am left, and they seek my life.” “But what says the divine answer to him?” “Divine” is superfluous; and “answer,” more clearly interpreted, would be “oracle.” “I have reserved for myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee,” that is, “knees, before Baal.”

¶ “So therefore also in this time the remnants, according to the election of the grace of God, have been made saved.” Two words are

TO THE ROMANS

superfluous: “of God” and “saved.” Thus the letter is: “the remnants according to the election of grace have been made”; but the interpreter added those two words for clarity of sense. Paul nonetheless, without them, teaches that in this condition of time the remnants—that is, the few Jews, as though remnants—have been made according to the election of grace: that is, they have been made conformable to gratuitous election; they have been made as the gratuitous divine election disposed them to be.

¶ “But if by grace ...” It is an ablative construction: and it signifies, “if by grace.” “Now not by works.” And the discourse is of the proper effect of grace. “Otherwise grace is no longer grace,” but wages or reward. And in the Latin text one whole sentence is lacking: “But if by works, it is no longer grace; otherwise work is no longer work.” For, conversely, work and grace are distinguished, and that which is given freely from that which is given from work. For that which is given from work is properly wages, according to the word: “Call the laborers and pay them their wages.” But that which is given freely is given liberally and not from debt. And if we confuse these, grace is not grace and work is not work: for they lose their proper notions.

¶ But why Paul added these things he declares by asking: “What then?” What is said from this? And immediately he adds the answer. “What Israel was seeking,” that is, “is seeking,” “it has not attained.” Recall what was said above at the end of chapter 9: that Israel, pursuing the Law of justice, seeks salvation. To that these words look: “what Israel seeks it has not attained.” For it seeks as though from the works of the Law, as he said there; and therefore it has not attained, because that attainment is by grace and not by works.

¶ “But election has attained.” Against seeking through works he sets election from grace. Therefore he says that the election of the remnants has attained salvation. “But the rest,” the non-elect, “were blinded.” Behold the punishment of interior blindness, by which they did not see the justice of God made through Christ.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

¶ “As it is written,” Isaiah chapter 29: “God has given them the spirit of compunction.” Where our letter has: “The Lord has mixed for you the spirit of deep sleep.” Nor is the sense of prophet and Paul diverse. For “compunction” is taken here for piercing, as also in the Gospel it is said that one of the soldiers pierced the side of Christ with a lance; and in the Apocalypse: “They shall look upon him whom they pierced.” Therefore the spirit of deep sleep and the spirit of compunction return to the same. For the spirit of deep sleep is the spirit of a man as though affected by sleep; and similarly the spirit of compunction is the spirit of a man as though struck. What is common to both (to those asleep and to those struck) is to be as though outside oneself and nearly lifeless. That this is the literal sense the things that follow both here and in the prophet testify, for, as a deprivation of sense, it is added: “Eyes that they may not see and ears that they may not hear.” These are taken from Isaiah chapter 6; for Paul fused from both places one sentence. For to a spirit like that of one struck, it follows to have eyes and not see, ears and not hear, as experience testifies in the body. And proportionally he describes the interior state of soul: that, as though struck, they are so stupefied that they use neither the eyes of the mind nor the ears of the mind for seeing and hearing the mysteries of the Messiah.

¶ These things are ascribed to God as inflicting them, because he does them negatively, namely, by not granting them grace. “Unto this present day.” These are Paul’s words, because, with experience as witness, he saw the Jewish race persevering as though stupefied toward the mysteries of the Messiah.

¶ “And David says,” Psalm 69: “Let their table become ...” “Before them” is superfluous, although in the text of the Psalm it is present. “Into a snare and into a hunting,” that is, into a chase. What is said here optatively is in the Hebrew put in the future indicative; but Paul seems to have used the common interpretation. And the sense is: the table of the Jews’ faith (that is, Sacred Scripture, which is the table of their believing) becomes for them a snare. The order is inverted: it becomes for them a chase, and then a snare; “and into a scandal,” that is, an occasion of

TO THE ROMANS

stumbling, for striking; “and into a retribution to them,” that is, justly as their merits require. For Sacred Scripture, which was given to the Jews to nourish faith, to illumine them concerning what must be believed, has been turned, because of the sin of the Jews, into a snare binding them so that they do not believe in the Messiah, and likewise into a chase as though pursuing them to the same, and likewise into a stumbling-block.

¶ And the reason is added: “Let their eyes be darkened so that they may not see,” that is, their interior eyes shall be darkened so that they do not see, so that they do not discern in the sacred letters the mysteries of the Messiah now fulfilled. “And bow down their back always.” This too is imperative in the Hebrew, where it is: “And make their loins continually to slip.” By which it is signified that the Jews, as though bearing a weight and pressed by the weight, continually slip. And indeed they are pressed continually by the greater weight of sins; and by this they are always bowed down.

¶ “Therefore I say, have they stumbled so that they should fall?” “Thus” is superfluous. The end, “so that they should fall,” is expressed both to exclude usefulness and to exclude restoration. Thus the sense is: Have they struck so that they should fall without usefulness? and likewise so that they should fall without restoration? For according to each sense Paul responds: “God forbid,” the response of one recoiling according to both senses.

¶ Note that from the time of Christ two extremes and one middle must be distinguished. One extreme is the sin of the Jews beginning from the persecution and killing of Christ. The other is the full conversion of the Jews to Christ, which will be at the end of the world. But the middle is the conversion of certain Jews to the faith of Christ. Paul therefore intends to proceed from the extreme conditions, and to declare from the usefulness of the extremes the usefulness also of the middle. And he begins from the usefulness of the first extreme, saying:

¶ “But by their offense ...” He treats both senses at once, because the verification of usefulness also infers that restoration is truly to be. He therefore describes the usefulness (both of the Gentiles and of the Jews)

CHAPTER ELEVEN

accompanying the fall of the Jews. And the usefulness for the Gentiles is signified by adding: “salvation to the Gentiles.” Here it is expressly said that by the Jews’ offense there is salvation to the Gentiles; but the verb is not expressed, whether “is” or “has been” or “is preserved.”

¶ And one can understand the verb of being, referring it to the offense by which they killed Christ: from that offense the salvation of the Gentiles is, by way of occasion. Nor is that offense outside the notion of the fall of the Jews, because it was meritorious of the ruin of the Jews. And one can understand the verb “is preserved,” since by the offense of the Jews’ persevering obstinacy the salvation of the Gentiles is preserved. For just as divine providence, for the salvation of the Gentiles, scattered Israel throughout the whole world many centuries before, so that when the Messiah was preached by the Apostles and other disciples of Christ, the Jews themselves, dispersed, would be witnesses that the Messiah promised to their fathers had come, and the like—so too it orders the obstinacy of the Jews toward the preservation of the faith of the Gentiles.

¶ For we derive two greatest utilities from their obstinacy. One is the credibility of the sacred books. The other is the promise of the Messiah. For if all Jews had been converted to Christ, the world would already think that the Jews had approved the books of the Old Testament that we have by their own invention; and likewise it would be believed that it was a human invention that the Messiah had been promised. But since the Jews, enemies of Christ, persevere, and bear witness that there were no other canonically sacred books among the fathers except these, and since to this day they await the Messiah, the human suspicion is removed that Christians fabricated either the authority of Sacred Scripture or the promise of the Messiah. And every occasion of oblivion is removed for any posterity concerning the crucified Christ and other such things, whose memory would be subject to the danger of oblivion unless the obstinate nation of the Jews, an enemy of Christ, persevered.

¶ Therefore by their offense the salvation of the Gentiles both is and is preserved—by way of occasion, however. “In order that they may be provoked to jealousy.” If it must be rendered word for word, it must be

TO THE ROMANS

read: “to provoke them to jealousy.” And the pronoun “them” does not agree grammatically with “Gentiles,” because in Greek it is neuter, but “them” is masculine; hence it seems to point to the Jews, who had been indicated by the pronoun “their.” It is as though it were said: for this purpose, that the Jews should be provoked to jealousy—without doubt, by the Gentiles.

¶ This is the usefulness of the Jews accompanying their fall. For as divine providence orders the fall of the Jews into the salvation of the Gentiles by the utilities mentioned, so it also orders the salvation of the Gentiles into the salvation of the Jews, so that by jealousy of the Gentiles they may be aroused to salvation—some individuals in the meantime, and at last all. Paul in his manner proposes these things, and afterward declares them individually, beginning from the last, namely, the usefulness of the Jews who are stirred to jealousy.

¶ “But if their offense is riches to the world.” By saying “to the world,” he shows that he speaks of the offense of the Jews as useful to the whole world, and not only as useful to the Gentiles. But it is clear that the offense of the Jews enriching the world is the killing of Christ. “And their diminution the riches of the Gentiles.” The diminution of the Jews is understood either as the punishment by which the obstinate Jews have been diminished from the true understanding of Scripture, or as the smallest part of the Jews converted to Christ. According to either understanding it is verified that the Jews’ diminution is riches to the Gentiles. According to the first, this has already been declared; according to the second, it is clear, because the Apostles and the first fathers of the Church—the smallest part of the Jews—enriched the Gentiles with spiritual riches.

¶ “How much more their fullness?” Although he set down two things (the offense and the diminution), yet he does not say “how much more their innocence” or “their justice” against the offense, because without the death of Christ accomplished by the offense of the Jews the world would lack the riches of the Spirit. But he says only “how much more their fullness” against the diminution. And the argument is formal:

CHAPTER ELEVEN

if the diminished part enriches the Gentiles, how much more would the whole race of the Jews enrich the Gentiles. Of itself the argument fits and concludes, although by accident the conversion of all Jews would have harmed the Gentiles for the reasons stated above. Yet Paul uses this argument to signify how useful, of itself, the conversion of the Jews to Christ is to the world, and how useful it is to the Gentiles that the Jews at least, by jealousy, come to Christ. And by saying “fullness” he shows that he proceeds from the condition of the last extreme.

¶ “For I speak to you Gentiles.” He turns aside to the Gentiles, that is, those converted to the faith from among the Gentiles. “Insofar as,” for so the Greek text sounds—though that “insofar as” is ambiguous between “as long as” and “insofar as”; yet it seems to fit the intention better as “insofar as.” “I indeed am the Apostle of the Gentiles.” The apostleship of Paul with respect to the Gentiles was first named at Jerusalem when Paul was with the other Apostles, as is written to the Galatians chapter 2. Yet he is gathered to have been appointed Apostle of the Gentiles by the Holy Spirit from the Acts of the Apostles, where Paul, sent by the Holy Spirit, offered to God the firstfruits of the Gentiles in Sergius Paulus the proconsul. And in the conversion of Paul himself by Christ it was said to Ananias about Paul: “This man is for me a vessel of election, to carry my name before the Gentiles.” Thus the Gentiles were first named in the office of Paul by Christ, though not alone; for it is added also “and the children of Israel.” Paul is therefore called Apostle of the Gentiles because his principal office was toward the salvation of the Gentiles.

¶ “I magnify my ministry,” that is, “I glorify it.” This is verified on two grounds. First, on the part of the salvation of the Gentiles: for in this—that he promotes the salvation of the Gentiles—he glorifies his ministry, and the increased salvation of the Gentiles is a greater occasion of jealousy for the Jews. Second, on the part of his own race: for in this—that he commends the conversion of the Jews as so useful to the Gentiles—he glorifies the ministry of his apostleship to the Gentiles. And from this also the occasion of jealousy of the Jews is increased: so that, at least

TO THE ROMANS

by seeing Paul the Jew produce such fruit among the Gentiles, they may be stirred by a holy envy to Christ. Both heads suit what follows:

¶ “If by any means I may provoke to jealousy my flesh,” that is, the Jews, “and may save some of them.” It clearly appears that he comes from the extremes to the middle: for the usefulness of the Jews proposed was jealousy, both future in the extreme and present in the middle, which daily occurs in some.

¶ “For if the loss of them is the reconciliation of the world.” He declares what was said above, namely, that if their offense is riches of the world. There he said “offense”; here he says “loss,” which is the effect of the offense. There he said “riches of the world”; here he explains the riches of the world by saying: “the reconciliation of the world.” And since there he inferred nothing proper corresponding, therefore now, declaring and explaining, he adds: “What shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead?” And the sense is: What else is the joining of all Israel to Christ but life from the dead, but the state that will be after the resurrection of the dead? For the argument proceeds to the greater from the greater: if the loss of the Jews is the occasion of so great a good, namely, the reconciliation of the world, their restoration is reserved for a much greater good, namely, life from the dead; for we believe that almost at the end of the world (when there will be life from the dead) all Jews are to be brought back to Christ.

¶ “But if the firstfruits are holy ...” The word translated “firstfruits” is also ambiguous with “tasting,” but it fits the intention better to read: “If the firstfruits are holy, so also is the mass.” For the context requires that Paul intends to speak of the beginning of the mass; and it is evident that the firstfruits of fruits are the beginning of the mass. Therefore he argues most fittingly: if the firstfruits are holy, the whole mass is also holy. For he intends by this metaphor to say that because the beginning of the Jews is holy, the whole mass of the Jews has that from which it may be holy—just as, in the Law, when the firstfruits of grain were offered and thereby sanctified to God, the whole mass of bread that was afterward made had that from which it would be holy.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

¶ And he adds the same with a clearer metaphor: “And if the root is holy, so are the branches.” Supply: holy. And he intends by these metaphors that the whole race of the Jews has, as it were, a legal and natural holiness, although in fact for a time it lacks it. For the metaphor of firstfruits and mass shows the legality, but the metaphor of root and branches shows the naturalness of holiness. And he said all these things not to aggravate the offense of the Jews, but to show the Jews’ suitability—both legal and natural—for being joined to Christ. For he is treating of their future joining.

¶ “But if some of the branches were broken off.” He declares one mode by which the offense of the Jews was salvation to the Gentiles, namely, that Gentiles were substituted into the branches of the patriarchal root in place of the broken branches, namely, the Jews. For the Gentiles were substituted as sons of Abraham, as sons of Israel to whom the promise of salvation through the Messiah was made; and thus the breaking of the natural branches yielded to the salvation of the grafted branches. Understand these things as to fact; for speaking of what was possible, even if the Jews had not been obstinate, even if the natural branches had not been broken off, the Gentiles would have been grafted in.

¶ “But you ...” He addresses the Gentiles. “Whereas you were a wild olive, you were grafted in among them, and have become a companion,” that is, “a partaker, of the root and the fatness of the olive tree.” The olive is taken for the tree. “Do not glory against the branches.” He reproves the Gentiles lest they glory against the Jews from the usefulness attained among the Gentiles themselves. “But if you glory, consider that you do not bear the root, but the root bears you.” First he prohibited glorying against the branches from the conditions of the branches, because those are natural and these are inserted. And because this did not suffice to restrain glorying against the branches, therefore he adds an irrefutable reason on the side of the root, as though he said more openly: If you are permitted to glory against the Jewish branches, consider that the root too is Jewish, and it bears you, not you it; and thus

TO THE ROMANS

your glorying against the Jews will cease. For the Patriarchs and the Prophets hold the place of the root, and they sustain the living truth of faith of all the branches. Hence elsewhere Paul says: “built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets.”

¶ “You will say therefore ...” He proceeds with a detailed disputation with the Gentiles, setting forth their words of glorying against the Jews. “The branches were broken off that I might be grafted in.” Paul responds: “Well,” that is, I approve what you say; yet consider what I add. “They were broken off because of unbelief, but you stand by faith.” Consider the reason for their breaking off and the reason for your grafting in. “Do not be high-minded, but fear.” Here pride is excluded and fear is instilled. “For if God did not spare the natural branches, perhaps neither will he spare you.”

¶ “See therefore the goodness and severity of God: on those indeed who fell, the severity of God; but on you, the goodness of God, if you remain in goodness; otherwise you also will be cut off. And they also, if they do not remain in unbelief, will be grafted in; for God is able to graft them in again. For if you were cut out of the natural wild olive and, contrary to nature, were grafted into the good olive, how much more will these, who are according to nature, be grafted into their own olive?” The text is sufficiently clear with the likeness of the olive and the wild olive. By these trees understand what is said “according to nature” and “contrary to nature.” And there is something proportionally similar in Jews and Gentiles, insofar as the Jews have a holiness as though natural and legal, but the Gentiles in neither way.

¶ “For I do not wish you to be ignorant, brothers, of this mystery.” What he has thus far described by so many metaphors, he now explains as the mystery of the future salvation of the Jews. “So that you be not wise in your own eyes,” that is, rather, so that you not be puffed up. For the Greek word is ambiguous and at times bears upon elation of soul, though it signifies what belongs to the cognitive part. And indeed it very much fits the intention that this future mystery is signified in order to restrain the elation of the Gentiles against the Jews.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

¶ “That blindness in part has happened in Israel.” This is not the mystery, but what follows: “Until the fullness of the Gentiles should enter in; and thus all Israel shall be saved.” He discloses two new things by this declared mystery. One is the temporality of the blindness of the people Israel: for by this it is known that it is not perpetual, but for a time, namely, until the fullness of the Gentiles enters in. The other is that, when this time is completed, not some broken-off ones but all Israel then found will be saved.

¶ “As it is written,” Isaiah chapter 59: “There shall come out of Zion the deliverer, and he shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.” The Messiah is foretold as to come out of Zion, that is, from the stock of David; for Zion is called the city of David, and in it was the royal seat of the kingdom of David. But he is called “deliverer” to signify the difficulty of freeing the Jews from their unbelief. But the effect is signified manifestly by saying that he “shall turn away ungodliness,” not poverty and whatever other bodily evils, but sins; and not from one or many, but from Jacob, from the whole people Israel. “And this shall be my covenant with them, when I shall take away their sins.”

¶ Note that Paul, by way of exposition, added these words: “when I shall take away their sins.” For in Isaiah it is read thus: “The Redeemer shall come from Zion, and to those who return from iniquity in Jacob; this is my covenant with them,” and nothing more is there. But Paul, to declare the condition of the New Testament in contrast to the old, added the declaration that then there would be a new covenant between God and men when he came to take away sins. For the first covenant was on Mount Sinai, when he did not take away sins but the bodily servitude of Israel to the Egyptians.

¶ “As to the Gospel indeed, they are enemies.” He renders a reason for so great an interval by which the fulfillment of this promise to the people Israel is delayed. And he says that the Jews have two conditions relative to God. The first is that, as to the Gospel, that is, as to the form of evangelical faith and doctrine, they are enemies of God. “For your sake,”

TO THE ROMANS

Gentiles, that is, by reason of your salvation, which from the fall of the Jews is and is preserved, as was declared above.

¶ The other condition is: “But as to election,” that is, insofar as they stand under the divine election by which he chose to save all in faith, “they are most beloved,” that is, loved by God, “for the fathers’ sake,” for the merits of the fathers, for the divine promises disposed for their fathers.

¶ “For the gifts and the calling of God are without repentance,” that is, irrevocable. The interpreter added “are.” For Paul, as I think, accustomed to Hebrew speech, often speaks without a copulative verb. He proves that the divine election toward the Jews in the end is immovably firm, because the gifts of God and the calling of God (understand: proceeding from election) are irrevocable, such that God never repents of them. And he said this in contrast to gifts and callings that do not proceed from election, but are only according to present justice, or are gifts pertaining to the body or external things. For such effects, because they are destroyed, are as though repented of: God bears himself toward them in the likeness of one who repents, according to what is written: “It repents me that I have made man.”

¶ “For as you also once did not believe God ...” He declares, as it were, a certain reciprocity disposed by divine providence in this delayed conversion of the Jews. That you may see it more clearly, set before the eyes of the mind that the progress of the conversion of the Gentiles has three terms: unbelief of the Gentiles as the term from which (for they were unbelievers), mercy attained as the term to which, and the unbelief of the Jews as the occasion, as was declared. Then set likewise the progress of the future conversion of the Jews according to three terms: the unbelief of the Jews as the term from which, the mercy to be attained as the term to which, and the mercy the Gentiles have attained as the occasion of the conversion of the Jews. For above it was already said that the Jews might be provoked to jealousy, that they might be moved to jealousy of the salvation of the Gentiles.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

¶ Paul explains this in this text, likening these progresses—here of the Gentiles, there of the Jews—according to these terms, beginning from the progress of the Gentiles, because he likens the progress of the Jews to the progress of the Gentiles by these terms. For when he says to the Gentiles, “you did not believe,” he shows the term from which. “But now you have attained mercy”: behold the term to which. “By their unbelief,” that is, by the unbelief of the Jews: behold the occasional middle.

¶ “So also these,” namely, the Jews, “have now not believed”: behold the term from which. “By your mercy,” that is, by occasion of your mercy: this is an ablative construction. For the sense is: by occasion of your mercy, that is, that they may be provoked by your mercy. For therefore the Jews have been permitted not to believe in Christ, that by the example of mercy attained by the Gentiles they may be provoked to Christ, as will be in the end of the world, and as daily happens in some. “So that they too may attain mercy”: behold the term to which.

¶ “For God has shut up all,” that is, all, “in unbelief,” that is, unto unbelief, “so that he might have mercy upon all.” He renders the reason on God’s part for such progresses as to the sins permitted, attributing to God that he shut up all, both Jews and Gentiles, permissively in the sin of unbelief, as though in a net, to this end: that he might have mercy on both, lifting them up from the wretched state of unbelief and consequently from the misery of punishments owed to unbelievers.

¶ “O the depth ...” Up to this point Paul rendered reason for divine election, reprobation, vocation, permission, and the like. And lest you think his intention was to hand down a complete doctrine concerning such works of God, he adds their incomprehensibility. He adds this by an exclamation of admiration, so that even by his manner of speaking he confesses his own ignorance, saying: “O the depth,” that is, the loftiness—though the Greek word also signifies depth.

¶ “Of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God.” “And” is lacking; it must be read: “of the riches both of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God.” He admires not wisdom and knowledge, but the riches of wisdom and knowledge, so that by the name of riches he might

TO THE ROMANS

signify the immense abundance both of divine wisdom and of divine knowledge. For he stammers as he can, echoing the high things of God; for the depth of riches describes the intensive and extensive immeasurableness of divine wisdom and knowledge. The difference between wisdom and knowledge is similar to the difference between species and genus: for wisdom is a species of knowledge, signifying that kind of knowledge by which the supreme judgment and order are disposed. Hence he ascends from the species to the genus: he admires the immense riches not only of the reasons of divine judgments and orders, but universally of the whole divine knowing.

¶ “How incomprehensible,” that is, “unsearchable, are his judgments.” He explains the effect of wisdom, for judgments are the effects of wisdom. And he admires these as unsearchable, because no creature suffices to search out completely the reasons of divine judgments. “And his ways are untraceable.” The negative must be supplied: and his ways are not traceable. The ways of God—namely grace and truth, to which all the ways of the Lord are reduced—cannot be traced, not only by men, but not even by angels, understand: perfectly.

¶ “For who has known the mind,” that is, the understanding, “of the Lord? Or who has been his counselor?” He proves what he said. And directly he first proves the loftiness, then the riches. Yet concomitantly he also proves the unsearchable judgments and untraceable ways; for these are first in their reasons; and thus, with the first proved, these too are proved. He proves the loftiness by the authority of Isaiah chapter 40, where the second part of this sentence is clearly found; but the first under other words. For our letter has: “Who has helped the Spirit of the Lord?” A new interpretation from the Hebrew has: “Who has directed the Spirit of the Lord?” Paul has: “Who has known the mind of the Lord?” And “who has directed” fits with the disjunction “or who has been his counselor,” to exclude both a superior director and an equal counselor. And because this sense fits Paul’s context (since by these two the loftiness is directly proved, because both superior and equal are excluded), therefore, when Paul says “has known,” he must be understood of the

CHAPTER ELEVEN

knowledge of approval proper to a superior—so much the more, because the Greek word placed here is sometimes used to signify to establish or decree; for this returns to the same as “to direct,” and belongs to superior knowledge.

¶ “Or who gave to him first, and it shall be repaid to him?” This sentence is taken from Job chapter 41, and brought in to prove the riches. For there would not be fullness of the riches of God if someone had first given to him, if he were debtor to another by what he had received. For in this very thing he would be found lacking, if someone had first given to him, if someone had a right to demand restitution. On the contrary, from the fact that no one has been able to give to him first, it is proved that nothing is lacking to his own riches.

¶ “For from him ...” The fullness of riches is proved in two ways. First, from the negation of need from another; and this has already been proved from the sentence of Job. Second, from the outpouring into others; and therefore he now adds the proof, saying: “For from him,” as efficient cause; “and through him,” as exemplary form; “and unto him,” as end, “are all things.” The interpreter added “are,” for Paul, without the verb, declares divine riches even to this point: that from him as efficient cause, and through him as exemplary cause, and unto him as final cause, not some things but all things. And indeed the substantive verb “are,” or some other such verb serving these causalities, can be supplied.

¶ “To him be glory.” “Honor” with the conjunction is superfluous. “Forever and ever.” “Of ages” is superfluous. Supply the substantive verb, whether “is” or “be.” “Amen.”

¶ With this, the proposed treatment is concluded: concerning the Gospel, that it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone who believes—the Jew first, and also the Greek.

CHAPTER XII

¶ “I beseech”—that is, “I exhort”—you therefore, brethren. Here St. Paul begins to instruct the Romans in moral doctrine. For after he had instructed them concerning evangelical grace, it followed that he should instruct them concerning the use of grace, which is moral. And he begins from the use of one’s own bodies. “By the mercy”—that is, by the mercies—of God. He exhorts them, indeed, in the manner of one adjuring them, by the divine mercies bestowed upon them, so that the exhortation may be rendered more efficacious. “That you present your bodies.” Behold the use of one’s own bodies. “A sacrifice.” He exhorts that we turn our bodies into a sacrifice; for he declares that bodies have been given to Christians for this use. “Living.” The first condition of this sacrifice is described as life, in contrast with martyrs, who present their bodies as a sacrifice to be slain. As if he had said more openly: I am not speaking only of the use of your bodies for sacrifice through martyrdom, but that you use your bodies as a living sacrifice; that is, while you live this life, present your bodies as a living sacrifice. “Holy.” The second condition is purity, undoubtedly removed from the defilements of sins. “Pleasing to God.” The third condition is the exercise of works which, in themselves, are pleasing to God. “Your rational service.” The word interpreted as “service” signifies that worship which we understand to be owed to God alone. And therefore it must be read: “your rational worship.” Yet the sense returns to the same point, since the discourse is not about divine worship in general, but—directly according to St. Paul’s purpose—it speaks of divine worship in presenting our bodies as a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing to God. And by this condition it is signified that the aforesaid conditions are not sufficient for the sacrifice of our bodies unless this fourth is added. For although a man may use his body with purity from those things which are in themselves sins, and with works which are in themselves pleasing, unless a relational reason is added, it

CHAPTER TWELVE

can happen that our worship in this sacrifice is less rational. For example, if a bishop or teacher, with the others preserved, were to consider less the impediments to greater usefulness by devoting himself to the sacrifice of the body, the worship would be irrational. And so with similar considerations which one must bring to mind when he offers his body to God by chastity, abstinence, vigils, labors, and other things of this kind.

¶ “And do not be conformed”—that is, “and do not conform yourselves”—to this age. After the use of the body immediately follows the use of external things. Concerning these he says in one word, “and do not be conformed to this age,” in the use of temporal things—money, honors, and the remaining things of this kind. What it is to be conformed to this age daily experience teaches: for it is to be conformed in affection and use, as men affected by this age are affected and use them. “But be reformed”—that is, “be transformed”—“in newness.” The word “in” is superfluous. “Of your sense”—that is, “of your mind.” He had proposed two difficult things: namely, the use of bodies as a sacrifice, and the denial of conformity to this age in the use of things. Therefore, to show the ease of both, he explains the manner by which each can be done, namely through the overflow of newness which they have in the mind, to transform them into these uses. For although both uses are difficult absolutely, nevertheless they are not difficult for those renewed in mind through divine grace, because from that newness of mind there is derived the transformation of the man into a new use of body and things. St. Paul therefore presupposes that the Romans have already been renewed in mind through the divine grace which he treated so much above; now he admonishes that by that newness of mind they be transformed, that they pass into a new form of using both body and things. “That you may prove,” that is, that you may perceive by experience. “What is the will.” The word “is” is superfluous. “Of God, good,” that is, willing good things. “And well-pleasing.” Not only does the will of God will good things, but also, as far as it is of itself, it is pleasing or sweet to all. “And perfect.” Both because nothing is lacking to it, and because it leads to perfection whatever good things it wills. And by these

TO THE ROMANS

he describes the fruit of each use. For he declares that through such uses of bodies and things men come to an interior taste so well disposed that, as if sensing by experience, they know the will of God as good—and therefore good and not evil for anyone—and well-pleasing, as if sweet to taste, and perfect, not deficient but nourishing and leading to perfection. This is in this life to begin the heavenly life: for in the homeland the blessed possess this perfectly, but travelers such as these experience it in some manner. For it was fitting, to such difficult commands, to add a precious fruit in this life.

¶ “For I say, by the grace that is given to me.” After the use of body and things, he passes to the use of the gifts which each has received from God. And by the grace given to him he intends his apostolate. And he prefaces this because he is about to admonish them to think modestly, lest anyone object to him: You exceed modesty, since it is not yours to order us and reprove us. Therefore, to meet this objection, he prefaces that he speaks from an authority not usurped, but given to him. Which indeed is truly grace, since it was bestowed upon him by Christ not from merits but freely. “To all who are among you,” no one excepted, Gentile or Jew. And he said this because in the preceding chapter he had turned aside to the Gentiles, lest anyone think he was speaking only to Gentiles.

¶ “Not to be wise beyond what one ought to be wise.” The word rendered here three times as “to be wise” is that which St. Paul frequently uses; concerning it we said above that it signifies the act of the cognitive part, which the Latin tongue does not explain by a proper term. Hence “to think,” “to care,” “to perceive,” “to be wise,” and the names of prudence and understanding are taken up in order to speak around it. Therefore, in order to express by circumlocution what neither “to be wise” nor “to perceive” signifies, “to perceive” nevertheless seems to be used more fittingly, for this reason: “to be wise” sounds like an act of virtue, but “to perceive” (not by the exterior sense but by the intellect) sounds like an act indifferent to virtue or vice. Therefore it would have to be read: “Do not over-perceive beyond what you ought to perceive, but perceive unto being modest.” For thus the Greek text has it, although it is commonly

CHAPTER TWELVE

interpreted “unto sobriety” or “unto modesty.” The first fault concerning the use of gifts is a certain species of pride applied to the action of the intellect, which is signified by “to over-perceive.” St. Paul does not say “to over-perceive” of oneself or of another, so that we may understand that in every matter (that is, either of oneself or of another, or of the use of a gift—and this is directly to the purpose) one must not over-perceive. And to what the preposition “over” is referred, he himself explains by adding “beyond what one ought to perceive,” that is, as the gift, office, ministry, and the like require. And lest the admonition rest only in the prohibition of excess, he adds an affirmation of the manner of perceiving, when he says, “but to perceive unto being modest.” Behold the limit: that you think, perceive, and judge within the bounds of the modesty fitting to you. If he had said “unto modesty,” a broader field would be left; but by saying “unto being modest,” he restricts it to the modesty fitting to each. For something is modest for a man which would not be modest for a woman; and something is modest for a teacher which is not modest for a disciple.

¶ “And to each.” The “and” is superfluous. This clause is joined immediately to what precedes, for it explains both that he is speaking about the use of divine gifts and the reason for not exceeding but keeping modesty. “As God has apportioned a measure of faith.” Behold the matter, namely the gifts of God apportioned. Behold the measure between excess and defect, according to which the mean is kept. He calls the divine gifts the measure of faith apportioned by God, because the first gift is faith, and the remaining gifts are certain measures of the first gift. They are measures because they are given according to measure—Christ alone excepted, of whom it is written that it is not given to him according to measure. He commands therefore that no one, beyond the measure of the gift given to him in faith in Jesus Christ, over-perceive in the use of gifts. For this excess is very harmful to any community, even a profane one, as experience testifies.

¶ “For as in one body we have many members, but all the members do not have the same act.” He proves from the likeness of the natural

TO THE ROMANS

body that such a measure must be kept. The likeness is clear. “So we, many, are one body in Christ.” Not one natural body, but one mystical body. Thus, however many we are, nevertheless we are one mystical body in Christ: that is, in faith, in hope, in charity, in imitation, and (which is the chief thing) in the Spirit of Christ. For Christ is as it were the soul vivifying the whole mystical body by the Holy Spirit. “But individually members of one another”—that is, “mutually.” We are not only one body with reference to Christ, but also individually with reference to one another, we are mutually members: that is, just as the natural members of one body are not only united in one body, but also, among themselves, are mutually members (for the eye sees for the foot and the hand and the remaining members; and conversely the hand works for the eye and the foot, and so of the others), so individual Christians are mutually members: for one works for another, and conversely. For this is the communion of saints.

¶ “But having gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us.” He had said of the natural members, “all the members do not have the same act,” and he had not yet explained the like in the mystical body of Christ. Therefore now he explains this likeness, declaring that we are mutually members in such a way that we do not have the same gifts, but diverse gifts. Thus the word “differing” is of the accusative case and is referred to “gifts.” And the order of the letter is: “having gifts differing.” He interposes “according to the grace given to us” so that we may understand that both the gifts and the difference of gifts are according to grace given to us, and are not from our merits but from the gratuitous divine distribution.

¶ “Whether prophecy.” He explains in particular the diverse gratuitous gifts of God bestowed upon the members of Christ, and at the same time he explains the modesty to be kept in their use, beginning from the gift of prophecy. “According to the proportion of faith.” The Greek word interpreted as “proportion” signifies a proportional ratio. The best use of the gift of prophecy is always to look to those things which are proportionate to faith. For those proclaiming things that are

CHAPTER TWELVE

not in due proportion to faith, count as false prophets rather than prophets. And because vain and unseemly things depart from the proportion of Christian faith, all who prophesy such things must be rejected.

¶ “Or ministry.” Behold the gift of office. “In ministering.” Behold the use: namely, that he both minister and be content with ministering. “Or he who teaches.” Behold the gift of a teacher. “In teaching.” Behold the use: namely, that he teach, and that it be enough for him to teach. “He who exhorts.” Behold the gift of exhortation. “In exhorting.” Behold the use: namely, that he exhort, not exceeding the limits of exhortation. “He who gives.” Behold the gift of means, by which he can bestow things or offices. “In simplicity.” Behold the use: namely, that with a simple heart he give, not as one intending repayment, or as one contriving something by the gift. “He who presides.” Behold the gift by which he is set over others. “In solicitude”—that is, in zeal. Behold the use: for the one presiding must be zealous in the matters that fall upon him. “He who shows mercy.” Behold the gift by which he both can show mercy and exercises works of mercy. “In cheerfulness.” Behold the use. For St. Paul commands that one aiding the wretched not do so sadly, not as if he had disgust for the wretched, but cheerfully relieve miseries: because from the one showing mercy the affection is perceived, and from the one in misery the relief is received with consolation.

¶ And know that in the Greek these are participles—“teaching,” “exhorting,” and the rest—so that the Greek text sounds more clearly in naming the gifts: “teaching,” “exhorting,” “giving,” “presiding,” “showing mercy,” which the Latin interpreter resolves into a verb and a relative pronoun.

¶ “Love.” This too is a gift. “Without dissimulation.” Behold the use of love. “Hating.” This too is a gift. “Evil.” Behold the use of hatred: namely, that we use it against evil, for the proper matter of hatred is evil which is truly evil. “Clinging.” This too is a gift. “To good.” Behold the use of clinging. “Charity”—that is, fraternal charity. Behold the gift, fraternal love. “Loving one another.” Behold the use. St. Paul commands

TO THE ROMANS

that we extend fraternal love to all mutually: that is, that all Christians love one another as brothers. “Honor.” Behold the gift. “Anticipating one another”—that is, preceding. Behold the use of honor: that each one actively precede another in honoring. “Solicitude”—that is, zeal. Behold the gift. “Not sluggish.” Behold the use: for zeal must be exercised without sluggishness in carrying matters out. “Spirit.” Behold the gift. “Fervent.” Behold the use: that the flesh not boil, but the spirit; that we use the spirit to burn in spiritual things. “The Lord.” This too is a great gift: to acknowledge God as Lord. “Serving.” Behold the use. “Hope.” Behold the gift. “Rejoicing.” Behold the use: for although hope has some affliction annexed to it on account of delay, nevertheless absolutely, as it looks to the thing hoped for, it produces joy; and its proper use, insofar as it is hope, is to rejoice. “In tribulation.” The word “in” is superfluous. And it matters little whether it is read as tribulation, affliction, or pressure: the evils of this world are signified. And these too are among the gifts of God, whence it was said above, “rejoicing in tribulations.” “Patient.” Behold the use, not from “to suffer,” but from the virtue of patience. “Prayer.” Behold the gift. “Persevering.” Behold the use of constancy. “Sharing in the necessities of the saints.” “Hospitality.” This too is a gift. “Pursuing.” The best use.

¶ “Bless.” The use is placed before here. “Those who persecute you.” This too is God’s gift. For he commands that we use persecutors to bless them: that is, to invoke good things upon them. “Bless and do not curse”—that is, “and do not curse.” St. Paul intensifies this command by forbidding any curses (whether by imprecating, or by detraction, or by speaking insult or contumely), and again commanding blessing.

¶ A question, however, occurs here: how does St. Paul forbid that we curse those who persecute us, when he himself, in Acts, chapter xxiii, cursed his persecutor: “God will strike you, you whitewashed wall”? The solution is that St. Paul spoke those words not by imprecating, but by reproving and announcing divine justice, as the words that follow manifestly testify. But we are not forbidden by this command, while reproving and preaching divine justice, to foretell future evils to

CHAPTER TWELVE

persecutors and to reprove present faults. St. Paul did both, from which he would have abstained out of reverence for the rank, if he had known that man to be the high priest.

¶ “Rejoice with those who rejoice.” He commands that we use another’s good by rejoicing. “And weep with those who weep.” The meaning is similar. “The same thing”—that is, the same—“thinking among yourselves.” The best use of the interior sense of any community is that they mutually think the same: for by this alone is concord preserved. “Not thinking high things”—that is, not perceiving high things. The impediment to thinking the same is to think high things. And the discourse concerns “high” relatively: that is, higher than one ought, than is fitting, and than is expedient. “But consenting to humble things.” The word interpreted as “consenting,” because it is a passive participle of the present tense, could not be signified in Latin by one word; therefore, by circumlocution it must be read: “but accommodating yourselves.” Thus the present tense is kept, and by “to accommodate” with “yourselves” in the accusative, it is signified. Hence the literal sense is: but to humble things—that is, to lowly or weak persons—accommodate your very selves. For this removes the impediment of thinking high things and fosters concord. “Do not be prudent among yourselves.” Rendering word for word, it should be read: “do not be prudent.” And this is for perfectly removing the impediments of discord. Some think it is imprudence to accommodate one’s own judgment to those lower and most lowly; therefore, meeting this opinion, he adds: do not be prudent among yourselves. And it is similar to that precept: do not lean on your own prudence.

¶ “Returning to no one evil for evil.” To return evil for evil properly is, by intention, to return evil, so that the intention tends to returning evil to another. And it is an illicit act for anyone. By this he admonishes that one not use the act of returning (which properly is an act of justice) with this intention—namely toward evil—even if the other deserves it; for evil must be returned under the aspect of justice when it is returned lawfully. “Providing good things not only before God, but also before all men.” Six

TO THE ROMANS

words are superfluous, namely, “not only before God, but also.” He admonishes that the use of providence have good things, not evil, for its matter; and that provision not be terminated only at goods, but also at goods “before all men,” that is, at goods such that, even before all, they have wherewith they are goods—distinguishing them from those who indeed provide goods, but not fenced about with such circumstances that, before all, they have wherewith they appear good, but leave room for suspicions of some evil mixed in. And because it is very difficult to observe this with respect to all men, therefore St. Paul adds: “If it be possible.” For by this he instructs that we provide, according to our powers, good things before all. And if it cannot be done so that they appear good to all, we leave the care of that to them. “As much as is from you.” The “as much as” is as “insofar as.” And the “is” is superfluous; nevertheless it is understood in the sense. “Having peace with all men.” The use of peace with all is commanded insofar as it is from our side. For the use of peace depends not only on us but also on others, who do not wish peace with men of peace, but use enmity or persecution and the like.

¶ “Not vindicating yourselves, beloved.” Between vindication and returning evil for evil there is this difference: to return evil for evil is formally, and from intention, to will to return evil; but to vindicate is materially indeed to will something evil, yet formally to will what is just to be returned. Hence to vindicate is an act of justice, but to will evil is an act of hatred. It was not enough for St. Paul to forbid “returning evil for evil,” but he also forbade “not vindicating yourselves.” And because the prohibition is of illicit things, it is clear from this that what he forbids is illicit. But note well what he forbids. For he does not say “not vindicating,” but “not vindicating yourselves,” to signify that he forbids a man to exercise vindication by himself on his own. From this it is clear that he can exercise vindication by the arm of the magistrate or the prince. Nor is the prince a transgressor of this command, because he avenges injuries either of a private person or of the commonwealth, even if they have been committed against his own person, since it is not he as a private man, but as prince by public authority, who avenges. And he adds

CHAPTER TWELVE

“beloved,” to soften the Romans in this precept commonly contrary to human impulse.

¶ “But give place to wrath.” There can be a twofold sense: either, yield to the wrath of those doing injury; or, reserve room for vindictive justice, which is not the virtue of private persons but belongs to those exercising public power. Either of these is accomplished by abstaining from vengeance by ourselves. “For it is written”—Deuteronomy, chapter xxxii—“Vengeance is mine, and I will repay, says the Lord.” The “and” is superfluous. He brings authority from the canticle of Moses, where we read more clearly: “Mine is vengeance and I will repay.” God claims vengeance as his own, he who alone can exercise all vengeance, he who alone leaves nothing unpunished. Therefore he judges that vengeance must at least be reserved to God, to whom it is proper to punish all evils.

¶ “But if your enemy shall hunger.” The “but” is superfluous. “Your enemy: feed him; if he thirst, give him drink.” This sentence is taken from Proverbs, chapter xxv. Above he had said that they should bless those who injure them; now he commands that they also do good to them. But note that this is not commanded absolutely, but in an article of necessity: by saying “if he hungers, if he thirsts,” so that we understand that doing good to an enemy in particular is not commanded except in an article of necessity. And then what is necessary must be supplied, when he says “feed him,” “give him drink.” For he does not say “enrich him,” “exalt him.” The precepts of God are rational: that nature and necessities be aided.

¶ “For by doing this, you will heap coals of fire upon his head.” There can be a twofold sense. Either by referring it to vengeance reserved to God: and thus the discourse is predictive of an increase of vengeance insofar as the enemy is more ungrateful to his friend because of the benefit of food and drink; so that, just as he previously admonished not to vindicate because God vindicates, so now he admonishes that an enemy who hungers be fed, because by this divine vengeance against the enemy as enemy is not diminished but increased; for it is of such a one that the discourse speaks. Or by signifying the occasion for the enemy’s

TO THE ROMANS

conversion from enmity to friendship. For no means is more suitable to provoke love than to confer a spontaneous benefit in a time of necessity. And thus this discourse, in the rationale of the command, brings a reason from the nature of the benefit: because it will gather as it were coals upon the head, causes kindling love toward you, in the enemy himself. And this sense very well fits both the text of Proverbs and the fact that St. Paul adds the conjunction “for,” saying “for by doing this,” so that we understand a reason to be given for the command.

¶ “Do not be conquered”—that is, “do not be conquered by evil; but conquer evil in good.” On every side St. Paul gives counsel. It appears to men, sons of this age, that it is a kind of succumbing not to avenge oneself, and further to do good to a hungry enemy. Against this St. Paul shows the opposite: that both to avenge oneself and not to feed a hungry enemy is to succumb to evil, is to be conquered by evil. The most base and weakest enemy is evil—not only enmity, but any evil whatsoever—since it is nothing, and by its own nature is hateful to all. But victory is to overcome the evil of enmity with good will, good affection, and beneficence. As if he had said more openly: If you think it shameful to succumb and be conquered, this very thing I admonish: that you not be conquered by evil, but conquer evil in good.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

CHAPTER XIII

¶ “Every soul.” After St. Paul has instructed the Romans concerning the use of the body, of things, and of the gifts of God, he pursues instruction concerning the use of liberty with respect to rulers. For he takes care lest, on occasion of the liberty obtained through Christ, the Romans think themselves exempt from the jurisdiction of secular rulers. Therefore he instructs them that they be subject to secular rulers. And more significantly he says “every soul,” when it ought to have been said “every man,” so that we may understand that not only our things, not only our bodies, but also our souls ought to be subject to secular rulers in those things which they can lawfully command. And by saying “every,” he excepted no one. “To higher powers”—that is, to preeminent—“let it be subject.” He does not say “to powers,” but “to preeminent powers,” distinguishing them from tyrannical powers; that is, of those who are not truly lords but tyrants. For the powers of such men are powers, but they are not preeminent powers; rather they are hostile powers, robber powers. Therefore, distinguishing from hostile powers, he says “to preeminent powers,” so that we may understand that it is not commanded that every soul be subject to tyrannical powers, but to preeminent powers; and so, in one word, to lawful powers.

¶ “For there is no power except from God.” Although this statement, taken by itself, is most universally true, nevertheless for St. Paul’s purpose it is restricted to the power of which he speaks: that is, preeminent power, lawful power. For from the fact that it is from God he proves that we must necessarily be subject to it. But it is clear that this reasoning would not hold if it were applied to every power in whatever way; for it is not necessary that we be subject to hostile power, which nevertheless is also from God. Therefore understand “preeminent.” Hence the sense is: there is no preeminent power except from God. And this, so that it need not be repeated, must be understood in what follows.

TO THE ROMANS

“But those that are.” The word “powers” is lacking. “Are ordained by God”—that is, “have been ordained.” Earlier he said that all preeminent powers are from God; now he adds that these same are also ordained by God, so that we may understand that not only the powers themselves, as to their substance, are from God, but also as to the subordination of others to them. For subordination of others pertains to the order of power; otherwise power would be without order. “Therefore he who resists”—that is, “resisting”—“the power, resists”—that is, “has resisted”—“the ordinance of God.” St. Paul infers that the one resisting preeminent power, while he thinks he resists a man, in truth has resisted the ordinance of God. He describes resistance to power with a present participle, but resistance to the ordinance of God with a verb of the past, because although the former is from intention, after the fact it is comprehended by knowledge to have been committed as resistance against the ordinance of God.

¶ “But those who resist”—that is, “have resisted”—“acquire condemnation to themselves”—that is, “take judgment to themselves.” He describes not only fault against the ordinance of God, but also punishment from the demerit of the resistance committed. And because he foretells that they will take judgment to themselves, and this is often not verified in this life, therefore this discourse speaks of the divine judgment: for nothing is left unpunished by divine judgment. For it is clear that to take judgment is to receive what is due to oneself by right.

¶ “For rulers are not a terror to a good work, but to an evil.” He tacitly meets an objection: by what reason do you say “let every soul be subject to preeminent powers,” putting fear of secular powers upon us, since the law of the Gospel is a law of love, and for Christians only God is to be feared? To this objection, I say, he answers in substance that secular rulers are not for fear to good persons but to evil; and by this they are not to be feared by true Christians not only in name but in reality. “They are not a terror to good works, but to evil”—that is, they are not a terror of good works, but of evil works. And he says truly, as far as the nature of the extremes is concerned, namely of ruling and of works. Yet it often

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

happens otherwise by abuse, as is evident in martyrs, who were punished by rulers for good works. But it was not from the nature of the works that there was fear, if there was fear in some cases, but because rulers abuse power. “Do you want not to fear the power? Do good.” What follows, “and you will have praise from it,” is verified relatively: for when evil works are punished, good works are praised, since punishment of evil is itself praise of good.

¶ “For he is the minister of God.” He gives the reason why rulers are not a terror of good works but of evil works: because they are ministers of God, and thus imitate God. “To you for good.” “But if you do evil, fear: for he does not bear the sword without cause.” “For he is the minister of God, an avenger in wrath to him who does evil.” Behold for what he is the minister of God: to vindicate, to exercise vindictive justice in the punishment of him who does evil. And from this it is evident in what sense it was said, “Let every soul be subject to preeminent powers,” namely insofar as the ruler is the minister of God. For in those things which he commands while exceeding the ministry of God, no one is subject to him.

¶ “Therefore be subject of necessity”—that is, therefore it is necessary to be subject—“not only because of wrath,” that is, because of the punishment which the ruler can inflict, “but also because of conscience.” And this is the conclusion chiefly intended. “For therefore you also pay tributes”—that is, you pay. After he has instructed concerning the subjection owed to rulers in general, now he descends to the species of tributes, drawing from the same source the debt of tributes. “For they are ministers of God, serving in this very thing”—that is, attending upon it. He makes manifest that the common cause of both (namely of subjection and of tributes) is this: rulers are ministers of God, attending upon this very thing, the ministry of God. Therefore, because they are occupied in divine ministry, we must pay tributes to them as their stipends.

¶ “Render therefore to all their dues.” Having shown the debt of both subjection and tributes, he commands, extending the execution of

TO THE ROMANS

justice to all debts toward all, respectively. "To whom tribute, tribute; to whom custom, custom; to whom fear, fear; to whom honor, honor." He enumerates in particular four: tribute, custom, fear, and honor. Nor is it without question what is said about fear, since in a true Christian there is no place for a debt of fear with respect to rulers, as St. Paul himself has now taught. The solution is that St. Paul does not say to the Romans that they ought to fear, but that to whom they owe fear they should render fear; thus, presupposing a debt of fear, he commands fear. This is a sound precept, presupposing that some Christians do evil, which in so great a multitude is unavoidable; for he had said, "if you do evil, fear." Nevertheless, fear of offending could be understood, though less properly, since fear has as its matter an evil of fault.

¶ "Owe no one anything except that you love one another." Lest the multitude of debts appear burdensome to man, he shows that all debts are only one debt. Therefore, summing up all debts toward anyone, he says that one ought to owe nothing to anyone except one, namely to love one another. And he proves this by adding: "For he who loves his neighbor"—that is, another—"has fulfilled the law." An excellent reason, because in this one the whole law is fulfilled. And that this is true he proves by induction, running through the individual precepts of the law. "For you shall not commit adultery."

¶ The pronoun "that" is lacking; it must be read: "For that 'you shall not commit adultery,' 'you shall not steal,' 'you shall not bear false witness,' 'you shall not covet,' and if there is any other commandment, is restored"—that is, summed up, or gathered in summary—"in this word: 'You shall love.'" The clause "your neighbor as yourself" is lacking; it must be read: "namely, 'you shall love your neighbor as yourself.'" In this one precept written in Leviticus, chapter xix, St. Paul intends to prove that all are contained.

¶ The sense of this precept according to the letter is that you love your neighbor, and love him in the manner in which you love yourself: that is, with the love of friendship, which is to will for him the good that is honorable, the good that is useful, and the good that is delightful, for

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

his sake, not for your own sake—just as you will these goods for yourself for your own sake. In this sense, if this command is fulfilled, the whole law concerning one's neighbor is fulfilled. "Love of one's neighbor"—that is, "for one's neighbor"—"does not work evil." St. Paul makes manifest the proof assumed, namely that all commandments are contained in this one, from the fact that love (understand: of friendship) does not work evil to one's neighbor. He says less and signifies more: for it not only does not work evil to another, but also does good to him. But because doing good is not always in the power of the one who loves, therefore he did not say "love does good to the neighbor," but "does not work evil to the neighbor," which is always and everywhere in the power of the one who loves. And in this very thing, that it does not work evil to the neighbor, is included not withholding a due good when and where one can: for to withhold a due good is to work evil. Therefore this reason is not diminished but includes the whole debt. "Therefore love is the fullness of the law."

¶ If you object that the Lord said that not on this one, but on two commandments (namely, love of God and of one's neighbor) hang the law and the prophets, know that the question is solved in two ways. First, that St. Paul speaks of the law as it is related to men, since he treats of debts to man. A sign of this is that he adduces only precepts of debts toward men, whereas the Lord speaks of the law absolutely. And this seems to be the literal sense, since above he had taught concerning love of God. Nevertheless it can be said that in the command of love of one's neighbor is included the command of love of God, as a cause in its effect. Or St. Paul does not say "therefore the fullness of the law is love of one's neighbor," but simply "love," so that proportionally he might signify that, just as love of one's neighbor fulfills all debts to man, so love of God fulfills all debts to God, so that proportionally on every side it is concluded: therefore love is the fullness of the law.

¶ "And this." Note that the pronoun "this" cannot be referred to the word "time" in the Greek text, for the one is masculine and the other neuter. Therefore the pronoun must be punctuated with a comma. For St.

TO THE ROMANS

Paul intensifies that this command of mutual love must be fulfilled because of an offered opportunity. Therefore the sense is: and this all the more must we fulfill. “Knowing the time.” The word “time” here signifies a fitting time, as giving an opportunity of acting rightly. Likewise, when a fitting opportunity for some business is offered to us, we are accustomed to say “behold the time,” intending not so much time as a fitting opportunity. “Because it is now the hour for us to rise from sleep”—that is, to be awakened. He uses the metaphor of night and day, sleep and wakefulness, comparing the state of fault to night and sleep, but the state of grace to wakefulness and day. And because negligence, insofar as it belongs to the state of fault, is fitting to night as sleep is fitting to night, and the time of grace, insofar as it belongs to day, holds itself as a beginning of day (for the clear day will not be until the future life), therefore, as if it were the beginning of day, he says: because it is now the hour for us to be awakened from the sleep of negligence. He intends that, since we know an opportunity is given to us by time to cast away nocturnal things, we ought to pursue diurnal things, by which the whole law is fulfilled.

¶ “For now our salvation is nearer than when we believed.” The word “than” is not a relative pronoun but an adverb corresponding to the comparative “nearer.” He assigns the reason for the fittingness of the time from the greater nearness of salvation now than when we began to believe. And this greater nearness is verified both according to time, because we continually approach death, in which our salvation will be, and according to the disposition of merits, because we continually advance in merits.

¶ Therefore the reason for rising from all negligence consists in this: that we are nearer to eternal salvation now than when we began to rise from sin by believing in Christ. “The night has passed,” the night of sins has already passed. “But the day has drawn near,” the clear day of eternal salvation has drawn near through grace. And it has truly drawn near to us, because it has already begun in us and continually receives increases if we do not fail the grace of God. “Therefore let us cast off the

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

works of darkness.” From the fact that night has passed, the casting off of works fitting darkness is fittingly inferred. “And let us put on the armor of light.” From the fact that day has drawn near and it is already dawn, it is fittingly inferred: let us put on the armor of light. He calls works consonant with light “armor of light,” because they are not only works, but weapons. And he said this in contrast to “works of darkness,” for sins, which are works of darkness (because everyone who does evil hates the light), are only our works. But the meritorious works of eternal salvation (which are called “armor of light”) are not only works consonant with light, but weapons, both defensive and offensive against enemies, by the power of divine grace.

¶ “Let us walk honestly, as in the day.” The word “as” is one word. He consequently adds the precept of walking against the rest of sleep, and the precept of the manner, saying “honestly, as in the day,” that is, as day requires a man to walk composedly. For although night is a time of sleep, if it happens that we walk at night we walk less composedly, as if night gave license to go in any fashion; but in the day it is moral for all to compose themselves, as if day demanded the decency of a composed person. “Not in banquets and drunkenness, not in beds and impurities, not in contention and emulation.” Behold the works of darkness: the first two are of gluttony; the next two are of venereal matters. For “beds,” by a decent word, signifies venereal work; and “impurities” signify lusts of touch. But the last two, although of another nature, nevertheless accompany the aforesaid: both contention or strife (by word or deed) and interior envy accompany carousals and venereal matters, as experience testifies; and therefore they are numbered among nocturnal works.

¶ “But put on the Lord Jesus Christ.” Behold the armor of light: to imitate the works of the Lord Jesus Christ. For after we have been clothed through baptism with the merits of Christ, it is fitting that by imitation of works we clothe ourselves with Jesus Christ—by patience, meekness, humility, charity, and the like.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “And do not make provision for the flesh in desires”—that is, unto concupiscences. He does not forbid that care be taken for the flesh, but for such an end, namely unto concupiscences. It ought to suffice for a Christian to provide for the flesh as to necessities and conveniences according to right reason, and not to extend provision for the flesh as concupiscences demand.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

CHAPTER XIV

¶ “But the one who is weak in faith.” Having already treated the instruction concerning the use of grace, St. Paul in this chapter instructs us about the use of grace toward those weak in faith, in two respects: first, with respect to the acts of the soul, which are to discern and to judge; second, with respect to the execution of an act that has scandal annexed to it. In his customary manner, he first sets forth what he will later explain. By “weak in faith” (not in body) he means one who, being as yet less instructed in the freedom of faith, regards as unlawful for himself certain things that nevertheless are lawful according to the freedom of faith. For such a one is therefore called weak in faith because he is less firmly established in those things that belong to the freedom of faith.

¶ “Receive.” That is, join him to yourselves. Not only are such persons not to be cast out, but he even commands that they be joined to other Christians. For he wishes them to be strengthened by that very fellowship, so that they may advance in faith.

¶ “Not in disputes about thoughts,” that is, not for adjudications of disputes. Lest the Romans understand that such weak persons are to be received in order to decide debates on either side, St. Paul expressly forbids this, wishing them to be received without such a judging of disputations. Why he says this, he adds below. These are the matters he proposes in summary.

¶ “For one believes.” He begins to explain what he proposed, starting from the first terms: namely, whom he calls weak in faith, while at the same time explaining the subject matter of the disputes. He therefore sets forth “weak in faith,” assigning the difference between the weak and the strong in the intended matter. And concerning the strong he says: “One believes that he may eat all things.” “That he may eat” is superfluous. Nor is the translator to be blamed for having rendered it obscurely, because it lies thus in the Greek text. The sense, however, is:

TO THE ROMANS

one believes that all things are lawful to be eaten. And this is the strong man in faith, who, supported by the freedom of faith, believes that any things whatever are foods, making no difference between one food and another.

¶ “But he who is weak”—not in body but in faith—“eats vegetables,” that is, “let him eat vegetables.” Behold whom he called weak in faith: the one who distinguishes between food and food, who distinguishes between flesh and flesh. And therefore he says, “he eats vegetables,” among which there is no distinction. Hence it is clear that he is speaking of Jews converted to Christ: some of them, sound in faith, ate all things even though they had been forbidden in the law of the Jews; but others, weak in faith, abstained from eating animals that were unclean among the Jews. And among them, because no vegetable was unclean, they are described as eating vegetables.

¶ “Let him who eats not despise him who does not eat.” With the first terms and the matter declared, he consequently explains what he had added in forbidding: “not in adjudications.” For he now pursues this clause: forbidding the strong to despise the weak, saying, “Let him who eats not despise him who does not eat.” Then he forbids the weak to judge the strong, when he adds: “And let him who does not eat not judge him who eats.” St. Paul holds both in balance. For the one sound in faith (who eats all things) is inclined to despise the scrupulous; and conversely the abstainer is inclined to judge rashly as though the one who eats all things indiscriminately were a glutton.

¶ “For God has received him.” He continues the admonition to the weak not to judge the strong on this ground: that God has received the strong, that is, has taken him under His dominion. Here note more carefully that the discourse is not about the common dominion by which God is Lord of all, nor about the special dominion by which He is Lord of those who voluntarily serve Him, but about the most special dominion, by which God alone is Lord of the hidden things of the heart. To that dominion belongs the judgment of works that are, in themselves, lawful, insofar as they depend on the heart of the doer. Thus, as to this

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

dominion, those sound in faith who eat all things indiscriminately are servants of God alone: whether they do so with a good intention or a bad intention is reserved to divine judgment alone; nor can they be judged by any man. Understand this text, therefore, concerning this dominion and this judgment.

¶ “Who are you who judge another’s servant?” A man strong in faith, who is judged a glutton because he does not distinguish among foods, is described by the likeness of another’s servant.

¶ “To his own master he stands or falls.” He meets an objection that excuses the rashness of judging on the ground of the brother’s benefit. As though he said more plainly: It is not your concern; for another’s servant stands to his own master so long as he stands, and he would fall to his own master if he were to fall. Yet these things, applied from another’s servant to the proposed matter, are not to be understood as though our standing profits God, or our falling harms God, for both are false when we speak of God in Himself; but both are true when we speak of the glory of God *ad extra*, for that receives increases and decreases.

¶ “But he shall stand,” that is, “he shall be made to stand.” In favor of the stronger he adds this. And rightly: because God is inclined to promote the goods He has granted.

¶ “For God is able to make him stand.” Lest you understand that a man is made to stand by his own powers, or even by merits, he asserts divine power, so that we may understand that perseverance is granted by divine power alone. For there is no virtue in man sufficient for this, as is clear from the fact that any traveler can fall; for this is reserved to divine governance, most powerful to preserve us lest we fall.

¶ “For one judges a day above a day ... but another judges every day.” Having explained the strong and the weak in the matter of food, he now explains these same persons in the matter of days. For among the Jews a distinction was established in these two matters: both foods clean and foods unclean, and days servile and days not servile. The one who distinguishes between day and day is called one who judges a day in

TO THE ROMANS

relation to a day—whether “above,” “beside,” or “beyond” a day; but he who uses every day indiscriminately is said to judge every day, as though equating every day. For, as has been said, this discourse concerns Jews converted: some followed Christian freedom from the institutions of the law of Moses, while others kept the sabbath instituted in the law of Moses. And these are the matters of the disputes, about which they argued.

¶ “Let each abound in his own sense,” that is, “let each satisfy his own mind.” St. Paul neither blames nor condemns either group, and he adds the reason: “He who regards the day, regards it for the Lord.” The contrary is missing here, namely: “And he who does not regard the day, does not regard it for the Lord.” Each serves the Lord, both the one who judges between day and day and the one who equates every day. Here note that the word translated “regards” is one that pertains to the cognitive part, for which perhaps Latin had not yet found a proper word. Hence one may say: he who thinks of the day, who has such a sense about it, who cares about the day, and so forth.

¶ “And he who eats, eats for the Lord, for he gives thanks to God; and he who does not eat, does not eat for the Lord, and he gives thanks to God.” Note, prudent reader, that the first reason concerning eating, taken from the likeness of another’s servant, was proper against rash judgment; but this reason is common, both against judging and against despising in the matter of food, and likewise in the matter of days. Therefore St. Paul embraces all here, showing that all four of these can be done without sin, provided they are referred to God. And that this is true he declares from like things, namely, living and dying. For we can use both life and death in relation to God; and by the same reasoning we can both eat and abstain, and both distinguish and equate days, using these in relation to God. Indeed, I say too little: for St. Paul does not speak of what can be done, but of what is in fact done. And rightly: because he speaks in the first person, so that we may understand that he speaks of those like himself (that is, constituted in God’s grace and charity). For

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

such persons give themselves and all that is theirs to God. Therefore he says of them: “For none of us lives to himself, and none dies to himself.”

¶ That is, no one like us, no one truly Christian, uses his life for himself, but directs it to the glory of God; and likewise no one chooses to die for himself, but for the glory of God. Understand what follows according to this sense: “For whether we live, we live for the Lord; or whether we die, we die for the Lord.” From which he infers: “Therefore whether we live or die, we are the Lord’s.” Because we direct both our life and our death toward God, it follows that we are not our own, not belonging to ourselves, but the Lord’s.

¶ And this also agrees with the end of Christ Himself: “For to this end Christ died and rose again, that He might be Lord both of the living and of the dead.” By each route St. Paul concludes that we are Christ’s. For he first concluded it from this, that we live and die for the Lord; now, however, he infers the same from this, that Christ for this very reason died and rose again, that He might be Lord of the living and the dead. Note that in the Latin text, after “rose again,” the phrase “and lived again” is missing. St. Paul added it to signify that He did not rise to die again, as Lazarus did, but that He rose in order to live again.

¶ “But why do you judge your brother?” With the immunity from sin in all these four matters declared, he adduces a common reason against all, both those who judge and those who despise, in either matter. And first he addresses the weak: “But you,” weak in either matter, “why do you judge your brother,” the strong? Then he addresses the strong: “Or you, why do you despise your brother,” the weak?

¶ “For we shall all stand before the tribunal of Christ.” From the fact that it will be common to all to be punished if we sin, he admonishes all to abstain from the sin of rash judgment and from despising. Nor does this sentence of St. Paul contradict the words of the Lord promising, “You shall sit upon twelve thrones,” and so forth. For both are true: all shall be set before Christ’s judgment with respect to punishment or reward; but not all shall stand—rather, some shall sit and some shall stand with respect to the examination. For those whose merits are

TO THE ROMANS

beyond all exception shall sit; but the mediocre and imperfect (as those to be examined) are said not to sit but to stand. St. Paul, therefore, speaks in relation to punishment and reward.

¶ “For it is written,” in Isaiah 45: “I live, says the Lord.” The text there has, “In myself I have sworn.” But it is the same, because that was the manner of swearing in that time: men swore, “The Lord lives”; but God swears by Himself: “I live.” The rest is clear: “For to me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess to God.” “Therefore each of us shall render an account of himself to God.” “Let us therefore no longer judge one another. But judge this rather.”

¶ After he has instructed that rash judgment and contempt are to be avoided in the weakness of faith, he now instructs that one must beware of the execution of an act that has scandal annexed to it. And he continues “judge” with “judge”: Do not exercise judgments about persons, but rather judge this—pass over to the judgment of an act. And in explaining what sort of act, he adds: “Do not place a stumbling-block for your brother, or a scandal.”

¶ Between “stumbling-block” and “scandal” I do not know a difference except that of Greek and Latin diction. Therefore it should be read in Latin: “an offense to a brother, or stumbling-blocks,” so that “offense” refers to the act producing an immediate striking, but “stumbling-block” to an act that can give rise to a striking. For when someone eats in the presence of weak persons whom he knows will be scandalized by his eating, he sets an offense; but when he does this in the absence of such persons, he sets a stumbling-block, because in the first case the act and the offense are together, whereas in the second a striking can follow or not follow. And by saying “do not place,” he makes clear that he is speaking not about believing or judging, but about the execution of an act: up to this point he has treated the actions of the soul, which are to believe, to judge, and to despise; but now he descends to deeds.

¶ “I know and am confident”—that is, I am persuaded—“in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is common of itself.” St. Paul determines that,

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

according to the knowledge of Christ, he knows that nothing is “common,” that is, unclean. He uses a word customary among the Hebrews to signify what is unclean, so that from this too we may perceive about what matter he is speaking. The phrase translated “of itself” is ambiguous: it can mean “through itself” or “in itself.” If it is read “in itself,” it refers to the matter: and the sense is, no food, no day is unclean in itself, that is, according to itself, for every creature of God is good. But if it is read “through Him,” it refers to Christ: and the sense is that through Christ nothing is unclean, for Christ granted all this freedom from legal observances and forbade no food and distinguished no time.

¶ “But to him who considers something to be common, to him it is common.” In itself, or through Christ, nothing of this kind is unclean; nevertheless, from the conscience of one who regards some food as unclean, it becomes unclean for him. Thus absolutely no food is unclean; but in relation to a conscience judging it unclean, something is unclean for that person. For food is not made unclean because of conscience; rather, it is made unclean for him, that is, it becomes unlawful because of his own conscience. Hence you have from St. Paul that an erroneous conscience binds. And the reason is ready: because he holds it as unlawful.

¶ “But if because of food.” He admonishes by a fourfold reason to the proposed point, namely, that a stumbling-block not be placed for a brother. The first reason is taken from the love owed to a brother: “But if because of your food your brother is grieved, you no longer walk according to charity.” The sense is plain: if because of your indifferent food a brother weak in faith is grieved, because he sees something unlawful, you, if you do not care about his grief, do not walk according to the love by which you ought to pursue your brother, by which you ought to take care not to afflict him with grief. For grief is a kind of evil.

¶ “Do not destroy him by your food, for whom Christ died.” The second reason is taken from the love shown to the brother by Christ; and he recalls so great a love that Christ died for him, plainly warning that one redeemed at so great a price as the death of Christ is not to be

TO THE ROMANS

destroyed for so small a matter as food. He is said to be destroyed either by reason of the sin of passive scandal, or by reason of the danger of apostasy. For such weak persons after grief break forth into rash judgments, and sometimes they fall back from faith, thinking that Christians do not live according to God.

¶ “Therefore let not our good be blasphemed,” that is, “your good.” The third reason is taken from the status, because the Christian state is the kingdom of God. Here St. Paul artfully turns the reasoning of Christians living freely against them. For they defended the freedom of their life from this, that the time of the kingdom of God had begun, which is free from all such legal observances; and therefore, as using the kingdom of God, they lived freely. St. Paul turns the reasoning from the kingdom of God against them: first, by declaring that the kingdom of God consists principally in internal virtues, and only secondarily has such freedoms concerning food and drink; and thus one should devote oneself to those things in which the kingdom consists substantially, not to these freedoms that are annexed and, as it were, accidental. Then, by declaring that the danger of infamy—indeed of blasphemy—against the Christian state must be avoided: for hearing that, under the pretext of the kingdom of God, you eat whatever you wish, they blame and even blaspheme the kingdom of God, as though it were a kingdom of food and drink. Hence, in order to avoid this blasphemy, he admonishes that they rather abstain than use such freedom.

¶ “For the kingdom of God is not food and drink.” The substantial reality of the kingdom of God does not consist in freedom, or rather in the use of freedom, to eat and drink indiscriminately. “But righteousness.” Rather, the substantial reality of the kingdom of God is righteousness, rendering to each his due. “And peace,” that is, tranquility without any occasion of disturbing anyone. “And joy.” For these three internal things—namely, righteousness containing every virtue, peace removing every disturbance both within and without, and joy not secular but “in the Holy Spirit”—perfect the substance of the kingdom of God, both in individual persons and in communities. It is called the kingdom

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

of God because God reigns in us: for it is evident that He reigns in us by internal virtues, and by them we are parts of the kingdom of God.

¶ “For he who in this”—that is, in these things, righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit—“serves Christ, pleases God and is approved by men.” Behold the proof that the kingdom of God consists in these. For the kingdom of God is both pleasing to God and approved by men. And he who serves Christ in these has each condition; therefore the kingdom of God consists in these.

¶ “Therefore let us pursue the things that are of peace.” The fourth reason is taken from the divine work, that is, from mutual edification and peace. For mutual edification is a work of God, which we ought to preserve; and he directly destroys it who scandalizes. Therefore, in this reason he first declares what that work of God is under the aspect of what must be pursued, saying: “Therefore let us pursue the things that are of peace, and let us keep the things that are of mutual edification.” “Let us keep” is superfluous. It should be read: “and the things of mutual edification.” For “let us pursue” is understood.

¶ “Do not, because of food, destroy the work of God,” that is, mutual edification and peace. And although all works, both of nature and of the soul, are works of God, mutual edification and peace are most singularly called the work of God: first, because this is proper to the disciples of Christ, as He Himself says, “By this shall all men know that you are My disciples,” and so forth; then, because peace is also proper to Him, as He Himself says, “My peace I give to you.”

¶ “All things indeed are clean.” If what was said above is considered, St. Paul said that all these are lawful, both what belongs to the strong and what belongs to the weak; and nevertheless he forbade the strong, by many reasons, the use of their freedom because of scandal, and forbade the weak to judge. Therefore now, concluding, he declares what is lawful or unlawful for the strong, and then for the weak. He therefore resumes: “All things are clean,” that is, all things are lawful according to themselves and absolutely, both to eat and not to eat, and so forth. And he resumes this commonly for both strong and weak. Then, specially with

TO THE ROMANS

respect to the strong, he declares what is good and what is morally bad accidentally, that is, by reason of scandal, saying: “But it is evil for the man who eats through offense.” And the discourse is about moral good and evil: he clearly says that the act of eating is evil by reason of the accidental circumstance of offense. And conversely: “It is good not to eat flesh, and not to drink wine,” and universally, “nor in that whereby your brother is offended,” that is, is struck. “Or is scandalized,” which in Latin is “is offended.”

¶ It seems that St. Paul by these two—“offends” and “is offended”—signifies either the difference stated above between one who is immediately struck and one to whom the occasion of being struck is given even if he is not struck; or he signifies the difference among those scandalized, according to this, that some in fact stumble while others are stirred toward stumbling. These two differences return almost to the same, since they differ only according to being near or not near. “Or is made weak.” Even if he does not stumble, even if there is no danger that he will stumble, but only this, that the weak one is made weaker in faith by such things, it is good to abstain. He named flesh and wine because they are chief among the desirable things of food and drink, so that from these you may understand any food and any drink whatever.

¶ “Do you have faith?” He meets an objection, by which someone could have said: I eat whatever pertains to the profession of my faith. He answers: You have a right faith about the freedom of foods; “have it to yourself before God,” that is, do not profess it by such an act before men, but it is sufficient for you to have it before God. And St. Paul said this because such an act is not of the necessity of faith, as is clear from those who live on bread and water alone.

¶ “Blessed is he who does not judge himself in that which he approves.” After he has shown the strong what is for them accidentally good or evil, he now shows the weak—whom he had forbidden to judge—what is good and evil for them, indeed what is blessed and what is wretched. And with respect to the act of judging, he calls them blessed if they abstain not only from judging others in disputable matter, but also if

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

they abstain from judging themselves in a matter that is certain and praiseworthy. For he wishes them to be imitators of himself, St. Paul, who said: “I am conscious to myself of nothing, yet I do not judge myself.” He commands the weak to be such, so that even in all approved works (that is, praiseworthy works) they do not judge themselves without dispute, do not pronounce judgment for themselves by justifying themselves, but leave judgment to God; and thus they will act not only well but blessedly.

¶ “But he who distinguishes”—between food and food—“if he eats, is condemned.” Behold the wretchedness. “Because it is not from faith. And whatever is not from faith is sin.”

¶ This reasoning of St. Paul is not without difficulty, because many human works are not done from faith, and yet are not sins. For when the gentiles return deposits or pay debts to creditors, and exercise other similar good works according to their kind, they do not sin—and yet they do not act from faith. The solution is twofold. One is that “not from faith” can be taken negatively or contrarily: the objection proceeds by understanding it negatively, but St. Paul intends it contrarily. For the weak in faith eat, contrary to the dictate of their faith, what they regard as unlawful; and therefore without doubt they sin.

¶ The other solution is to take “not from faith” negatively, but within the genus of works that ought to proceed from faith. And then the sense is: whatever ought to proceed from faith and is not from faith is sin. And this sense is more literal, because it does not draw the negation into contrariety, and it fits the matter: for the whole discourse of this chapter concerns works naturally apt to proceed from faith. For freedom from unclean things and the distinction between clean and unclean manifestly pertains to faith. Therefore, because eating such things ought to proceed from faith, and does not proceed from faith, it is manifestly sin. And the same is universal concerning all things that ought to proceed from faith. Hence the objection about good works according to their kind that the gentiles do ceases: for those proceed by their nature from right reason, even if faith is absent.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ Note, prudent reader, that these words of St. Paul are to be understood of things unlawful according to the complete notion of unlawfulness, that is, that such weak persons regard certain foods or days as unlawful according to the complete notion of sin—which is only mortal sin. For if someone were to regard a thing as unlawful as venial, and yet were to eat, he would sin only venially. And understand similarly of placing a stumbling-block formally, according to the proper notion of scandal, unto the mortal ruin of another. But that this is St. Paul's sense is clear from this, that he manifestly says: "Do not destroy him for whom Christ died." And again: "But he who distinguishes, if he eats, is condemned."

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

CHAPTER XV

¶ “But we ought.” In the beginning of chapter 13, St. Paul had proposed: “Receive the one who is weak in faith, not for adjudications of disputes.” And after treating the other clauses, he now explains what remained, namely: “Receive.” He treats this clause in the first person plural, both because of the difficulty of the action and in order to distinguish the more perfect from others, so that we might understand that this precept is directed to men more perfect. Hence, numbering himself among them, he does not say “we do well,” but “we ought,” to signify that it pertains not to the good of supererogation but to what is owed.

¶ “The stronger,” that is, the more powerful in spirit and in acts of virtue. “The weaknesses,” that is, the infirmities, “of the weak,” that is, of the powerless. They are called the weaknesses of the powerless, not bodily illnesses of the physically infirm, but ailments of the soul to which the less spiritual and less furnished with virtues are subject—of whom innumerable examples appear among the sheep of Christ.

¶ “To bear,” that is, to carry. This is fulfilled in many ways: sometimes by tolerating, sometimes by compassionating, sometimes by offering help by word and example, or even by deed.

¶ “And not to please ourselves.” “Ourselves” is missing. It should read: “And not to please ourselves.” St. Paul imposes two duties upon the more perfect. One is affirmative, namely, to bear the infirmities of the weak. The other is negative, namely, not to please ourselves. And he added this negative duty because its contrary presents an obstacle to the affirmative precept: for the defects of others naturally displease us; and therefore, if we pursue what is pleasing to us, we will not bear the defects of others. To remove, therefore, the obstacle to bearing the infirmities of others, he applied the best remedy: not to follow what is pleasing to us. Each of these is difficult for those untrained in works; and yet it is owed.

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “Let each of you,” that is, “of us.” St. Paul pursues these two points in reverse order. “Let him please his neighbor.”

¶ “Let him please in good unto edification.” He declares in what sense he said that in such toleration of the weak we should not please ourselves; and conversely, instead of pleasing ourselves, he says that each of us should please his neighbor. In this he teaches that our zeal ought to be to please our neighbor in these matters even if it displeases ourselves. Yet he adds two cautions. One is on the side of the matter, by saying “in good,” so that we may understand that pleasing our neighbor must be in a good matter, or at least in a matter not evil but referred to a good end, so that the act of the one pleasing is not evil but good. The other is “unto edification”: beyond the goodness of the act in itself, it should also be useful unto edification. For this is the aim of tolerating defects: that it be useful unto edification. And then it is both good and pleasing to the neighbor.

¶ “For even Christ did not please Himself.” He proves this by the example of Christ. “But as it is written,” in Psalm 69: “The reproaches of those reproaching You have fallen upon Me,” that is, have come upon Me. These words are brought forward in the person of Christ, directed to the Father. In them it is manifest that Christ did not choose what was pleasing to Him, but what was supremely displeasing, unto the edification of the Church. And the discourse is of pleasing and displeasing according to the natural affection of the will. For in this way we say that death, scourges, the cross, reproaches, and other such things displeased Christ—things which nevertheless, out of supreme love for our salvation, He chose and sought to suffer.

¶ “For whatever things were written,” that is, were prescribed, “were written for our instruction,” that is, were prescribed: “that through patience” in evils “and through consolation” in goods, “of the Scriptures”—that is, in the sacred Scriptures, remembered or taught—“we might have hope.” Behold the end of sacred doctrine: to have confidence in God both in adversities and in prosperities.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

¶ “But may the God of patience and consolation”—that is, of consolation—“grant you to think the same thing.” That word, so frequently interpreted in diverse ways, in this place is more rightly rendered “to have the same mind” or “to have the same sense.” He adds prayers to God for the Romans unto the effect of fulfilling this commandment. And for the purpose he invokes God as the author of patience necessary for tolerating, and of consolation necessary for pleasing one’s neighbor.

¶ “To think the same thing among one another according to Jesus Christ: that with one accord”—that is, unanimously—“with one mouth you may glorify God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” He petitions not only the same sense in the cognitive part but also the same spirit in the affective part; and what is more, he prays for outward concord as well.

¶ “For which cause, receive one another.” He treats the first clause, namely, “we who are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak.” And, as we said, not pleasing oneself removes the obstacle to bearing the defects of others; but striving to please one’s neighbor in good unto edification is the proximate cause of bearing the defects of others. Therefore, having removed the obstacle and set down the cause, he returns to the proposed precept, concluding: “For which cause, receive one another.”

¶ “As also Christ received you”—that is, us—“unto the glory of God.” The order of the text is: For which cause receive one another unto the glory of God, as also Christ received us. In this he simultaneously declares what it means to “receive” in this manner: namely, a receiving like that by which Christ received us, which was to suffer for us, to have compassion on us, to console us, to instruct and teach us, and moreover to present Himself as our companion, and so forth. And he commands that all these be ordered by us to the glory of God, so that in this too we may imitate Christ.

¶ “But I say that Christ Jesus.” He declares what he had said, “as also Christ received us,” first with respect to the nation of the Jews, and

TO THE ROMANS

then with respect to the gentiles, signifying not a small difference in the manner.

¶ “That He was made a minister of the circumcision.” That is, that He personally performed the office of minister with respect to the nation of the Jews, according to His own word: “I was not sent except to the sheep that have perished of the house of Israel.” For it is evident that Christ Jesus ministered only to the nation of the Jews, both by the word of doctrine, and by the working of miracles, and by social association.

¶ “Because of the truth of God, to confirm the promises of the fathers.” Behold the proper reason why Christ received only the Jews in this manner, namely, by ministering personally. For the truthfulness of God preserving the promises to the fathers is the proper cause. For God had promised the fathers that He would give them from among them and in their own lineage the Messiah.

¶ “But that the gentiles may glorify God for mercy.” Because such a promise had not been made to the gentiles, that reason founded upon God’s truthfulness has no place for Christ’s receiving the gentiles in the same manner. Therefore Christ was not in His own person a minister of the gentiles, but received them through His disciples. And just as there is a difference in the manner, so there is a difference in the reason. For the reason of receiving the Jews in that manner is truthfulness—faithfulness—keeping the promises made to the fathers of the Jews; but the reason for receiving the gentiles is mercy. And the discourse is of mercy as it is distinguished against the truthfulness of the promise mentioned, although that mercy was not sudden but was also long before announced through the prophets. Therefore it is said here that the gentiles were so received by Christ that they glorify God for mercy.

¶ And he adds: “As it is written: Therefore I will confess You among the gentiles.” “Lord” is superfluous. “And I will sing to Your name.” This sentence is taken from Psalm 18. They are the words of David after he gave thanks to God for deliverance from all his enemies and for his exaltation. For he directs his acts of thanksgiving to the future benefit of the Messiah already promised to him, so that upon benefits

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

received he may heap up the greatest benefit to be received. Hence, according to the letter, that text speaks of the time of the Messiah: for David prophesies that he will confess God through his Son the Messiah among the gentiles, and will sing to the divine name. Which according to the letter we see fulfilled daily, since daily David praises God and sings the divine name everywhere among the nations through his psalms. Which without doubt the Messiah both did and does.

¶ “And again he says: Rejoice, you gentiles, with His people,” that is, with His people. This sentence seems to be taken from Isaiah. Yet these words are not found there, and we believe that St. Paul brought the sense, not the words; or perhaps they are in the Hebrew and we do not have them interpreted thus.

¶ “And again: Praise the Lord, all you gentiles; and magnify Him”—that is, praise Him exceedingly—“all you peoples.” These words are from Psalm 117, written according to the letter concerning the salvation of the gentiles through the Messiah. Therefore all gentiles are invited to praise God.

¶ “And again Isaiah says,” in chapter 11: “There shall be the root of Jesse, and He who shall arise to rule the gentiles,” that is, to reign over the gentiles. Each nature of Christ is prophesied: the human, by saying “the root of Jesse,” for Jesse was the father of David. And the Messiah is called “the root of Jesse,” that is, from the root, from the generative power of Jesse, insofar as according to His human nature He drew His origin from there. But the divine is shown by the fact that it is said conjointly, “and He who shall arise,” from the dead, to reign over the gentiles. This is explained more when he adds: “In Him the gentiles shall hope.” Thus the incarnation, the resurrection, and the kingdom of Christ’s deity are signified unto the gentiles.

¶ “But may the God of hope.” Just as he joined prayers for the Romans to the negative commandment, so also he joins prayers to the affirmative commandment. He invokes God as the author, the reason, and the end of hope, both to continue his prayers with the fruit

TO THE ROMANS

prophesied by Isaiah, and because the fulfillment of the commandment must rest upon hope.

¶ “Fill you with all joy and peace in believing.” Those bearing the defects of others especially need these two: joy and peace, lest bearing itself be sorrowful and disturb the tranquility of the mind. He adds “in believing,” so that he may ask that both joy and peace be established upon faith.

¶ “That you may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Spirit,” that is, in the power of the Holy Spirit. Behold the end for which he asks peace and joy in believing: abundance of hope, not that which rests upon human power, but that which rests upon the power of the Holy Spirit.

¶ “But I am persuaded, my brothers—both I myself concerning you.” With the doctrine he intended to hand down about evangelical grace and its use brought to an end, St. Paul excuses himself—rather, he removes from himself an opinion the Romans could have conceived: namely, that he would think the Romans lacked teachers and instructors in such matters. This opinion he removes by confessing that among the Romans there are men full of goodness and knowledge, sufficient to admonish others.

¶ “For you yourselves are full of love”—that is, of goodness. And this as to the effect. “Filled with all knowledge”—that is, cognition. And this as to understanding. “So that you are able to admonish one another.”

¶ “But I wrote to you more boldly, brothers, in part.” With the false but imaginable cause excluded, he assigns the true cause why he dared to write to them, knowing that among them there were men so capable. And he says “more boldly in part,” that is: I used a certain boldness; in some respect I was somewhat bolder in writing to you.

¶ “As bringing you into remembrance.” He does not say “as bringing you into remembrance” absolutely (since in truth he wrote not by merely reminding but by teaching), but he says “as,” because he wrote in the likeness of one reminding. And this too is of no small skill: that a teacher, as though reminding, teaches equals or other teachers.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

¶ “Because of the grace that was given to me by God.” Although I was somewhat bold, the authority of my apostleship produced this boldness.

¶ “That I be a minister of Christ Jesus among the gentiles.” Behold the grace given to him not by men but by God. Nor does he say “that I be an Apostle,” but in a more humble name he says “that I be a minister,” for he acknowledges his servitude. And he significantly says “among the gentiles,” so that from this he may show the reason for his boldness in writing to gentiles.

¶ “Consecrating the Gospel of God.” Note what sort of minister: for the word translated “consecrating” is derived not from holiness but from what is sacred, and it signifies working what is sacred. It is as though he said: sacrificing the Gospel of God. Thus he says that he was chosen for this: that he evangelize among the gentiles in such a way that he turns the Gospel into a sacrifice. This then happens when we evangelize with so great reverence of life and morals as is required to celebrate fruitfully so great a sacrifice. Therefore he adds the fruit:

¶ “That the offering of the gentiles may be made,” as of things offered by me in the evangelical sacrifice, “acceptable and sanctified in the Holy Spirit.” “And” is superfluous. The intended fruit is that through the Gospel, as through a certain sacrifice, the gentiles be offered to God, not in any manner whatever, but so that this offering have two conditions: one, that it be acceptable to God; the other (which is the reason for the first), that it be sanctified in the Holy Spirit. For this is an offering not of things but of souls. Therefore its acceptability does not depend upon any sanctification whatever, but upon sanctification in the Holy Spirit dwelling in souls. This is the fruit to which the preacher of the Gospel of God ought to tend.

¶ “I have therefore glory”—that is, glorying—“in Christ Jesus.” So that the Romans might understand the use of apostolic grace, which was in St. Paul among others, and thus more readily receive his authority, he adds how he used his apostolic ministry, first of all referring all things to the glory of Christ, so that every suspicion of human vanity might be

TO THE ROMANS

driven away from what follows. He therefore affirms that he has something in which he glories, not in himself but in Christ Jesus.

¶ “In the things that pertain to God.” Some words are missing here. Rendering word for word, it would be read: “In the things that pertain to God.” In the Hebrew manner he speaks in an incomplete way. The sense is: in those things that pertain to God—distinguishing them from the matter of glorying about which he speaks elsewhere: “Most gladly will I glory in my infirmities,” and so forth. For now the discourse is about works directed to God, both of doctrine and of miracles and such things.

¶ “For I will not dare to speak anything of those things which Christ has not accomplished through me.” St. Paul had great care on every side to protect this glorying. For first he referred it to Christ; then he referred the matter to God; now he excludes every falsity of recounting.

¶ “To bring about the obedience of the gentiles.” That is, for this end, that the gentiles obey the Gospel.

¶ “By word,” of preaching, doctrine, the Gospel, and the like. “And by deeds,” of holy life and holy morals.

¶ “In the power of signs and wonders,” to include greater and lesser miracles that he had done.

¶ “In the power of the Spirit of God.” It is not “of the Holy Spirit,” but “of God.” And this clause refers to all and each of the preceding: word, deeds, signs, and wonders. For all these, in the power of the Spirit of God—not by magical arts, not by human fictions or devices—he declares that Christ accomplished through him.

¶ “So that from Jerusalem and round about, even to Illyricum, I have filled the Gospel of Christ.” St. Paul does not say “so that in Jerusalem and round about,” but he uses Jerusalem as the terminus from which, saying “from Jerusalem,” and he uses Illyricum as the terminus to which, saying “even to Illyricum.” And on this journey he affirms that he preached on every side.

¶ “And so I preached.” For he adds that his zeal was also, in the regions around from Jerusalem even to Illyricum, to preach the Gospel

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

where Christ had not previously been proclaimed. This must not be understood as though St. Paul refused to preach in places where Christ had already been announced; for, as is clear in the Acts of the Apostles, he preached at Antioch, where Christ had been announced, as is clear in Acts of the Apostles chapter 11. But rather he preferred places in which Christ had not been announced to other places. And I also understand that this was especially after he had been separated by the Holy Spirit with Barnabas to preach to the gentiles; therefore he perhaps placed that clause, “to bring about the obedience of the gentiles.” For from that time he chiefly strove to lead the gentiles to the obedience of the Gospel.

¶ “Lest I build upon another’s foundation.” These words are not of one despising but of one preferring: that is, not as though he judged it evil to build upon another’s foundation, but because he thought it better to preach where the faith of Christ had not been laid by others as a foundation. And unto this better aim he directly serves the Scripture added from Isaiah chapter 52: “But as it is written: Those to whom He was not announced shall see.” “For” is superfluous. And the sense is that gentiles, to whom it was not announced through the prophets, shall see with the eyes of the mind—whereas of the Jews it was said: “lest they see.”

¶ “And those who have not heard shall understand.” “Of Him” is superfluous. The gentiles who have not heard through the voices of the prophets shall penetrate the meaning—whose opposite was said of the hardened Jews.

¶ “For which cause I was also greatly hindered from coming to you.” After narrating the use of his apostolic ministry, he explains from it the reason why he had proposed in the beginning of the Epistle that he had been hindered from coming to the Romans. “And I was hindered until now.” All these words are superfluous. “But now, having no further place in these regions, and having a desire to come to you for many years.” “Already preceding” is superfluous. And thus he explains that he will execute his long desire to go to the Romans.

¶ “When I begin to set out for Spain,” that is, “when I am going to Spain, I will come to you.” For he still speaks conditionally, uncertain

TO THE ROMANS

about the future outcome. “For I hope that, passing by, I may see you.” “For I hope, passing through, to see you.” “And to be escorted there by you.” That is, “and to be escorted there by you.” “If first I have been satisfied with you in part.” He does not say absolutely “if first I have been satisfied with you,” but with a limitation, “in part,” as though he said plainly: to be satisfied with you wholly, that is, with your companionship, would be impossible for so vehement an affection of desire; but at least in some part I will be satisfied with your companionship.

¶ “But now I go to Jerusalem.” He narrates the intermediate time still before undertaking the journey toward Rome. And it should be read: “But now I go to Jerusalem, ministering to the saints.” And declaring the ministry, he adds: “For Macedonia and Achaia have approved to make some contribution”—that is, a sharing. He calls an alms a “sharing.”

¶ “For the poor of the saints who are in Jerusalem.” He does not say that all saints in Jerusalem are poor; he does not say “for the poor saints,” but “for the poor of the saints.” For many Christians in Jerusalem had means by which to live, as will be discussed more fully in the Acts of the Apostles. The rest is clear from these.

¶ “For it pleased them, and they are their debtors.” “For if the gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, they ought also to minister to them in carnal things.”

¶ “Therefore, when I have completed this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will go through you.” It would read: “I will return through you into Spain.” He says what he intends, but the Holy Spirit disposed otherwise, since he came to Jerusalem and so forth.

¶ “But I know that when I come to you, I shall come in abundance,” that is, “in the fullness of the blessing of Christ.” “Of the Gospel” is missing. It should read: “I shall come in the fullness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ.” And the sense is: I shall come in the fullness of the multiplication of the Gospel of Christ. He foresees that the evangelical fruit will meanwhile be multiplied in Rome, so that in coming he will find Rome full of the Gospel of Christ. Although this can

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

also be referred to the fruit of his coming: that in coming he will fill up the multiplication of the Gospel already founded in Rome.

¶ “I beseech therefore”—that is, “I exhort”—“you, brothers, by our Lord Jesus Christ.” He commends himself and the business mentioned above to the prayers of the Romans.

¶ “And by the charity of the Spirit.” “Holy” is superfluous. For he asks them by spiritual love, that is, by reason of spiritual love.

¶ “That you help me in your prayers.” “Your” is superfluous. “For me to God: that I may be delivered from the unbelievers”—that is, the unbelieving—“who are in Judea, and that the offering of my service may be acceptable to the saints in Jerusalem,” that is, “and that my ministry to Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints.” Unless “to Jerusalem” is construed with some preposition understood (for example, “toward Jerusalem”), or signifies the place of the ministry (because the distribution was to be made in Jerusalem), the speech is incomplete.

¶ “That I may come to you with joy by the will of God, and may be refreshed”—that is, strengthened—“with you.” See both the humility of so great an Apostle, seeking the suffrages of prayers even in things in a certain way small, and the confidence he had in the prayers of the Roman Church.

¶ “But may the God of peace be with you all. Amen.” And thus he ends the doctrinal treatment of the Epistle.

TO THE ROMANS

CHAPTER XVI

¶ “But I commend to you.” This final chapter needs little exposition.

¶ “Phoebe our sister, who is in the ministry of the Church which is in Cenchreae.” This woman, who (as will be evident below) carried this Epistle to the Romans, was in Cenchreae, that is, in the port of the Corinthians. And she was a minister of the Church of Christ there. By this it is signified that she was a woman given to hospitality toward the saints and to almsgiving. For it is added about her that she was a benefactress both of many and of St. Paul himself. In the Greek text, indeed, there are not words but names, namely “minister” and “benefactress,” so that we may understand from those offices of assisting and ministering, and from her favors and resources, that she supported the Church.

¶ “That you receive her in the Lord as is worthy of saints, and assist her in whatever matter she has need of from you.” From this it is clear that she was then going to Rome. But what is said, “as is worthy of saints,” signifies that she is to be received according to what is fitting for receiving saints. “For she herself has been a benefactress of many, and of myself also.”

¶ “Greet Prisca and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus, who for my life have laid down their necks.” Acts of the Apostles chapter 17 narrates Prisca the wife and Aquila the husband as dwelling at Corinth and then at Ephesus, with whom St. Paul lived together at Corinth for some time; but at the time of this Epistle they had returned to Rome, otherwise St. Paul would not command that they be greeted at Rome. They are praised because they were helpers of St. Paul in Christ Jesus. He says this lest we understand it of help in manual work, for Aquila was of the same craft as St. Paul. He intends to commend them as those who assisted him by persuading in the way of God, and who exposed their necks for the life of

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

St. Paul. This is believed to have happened when they were at Corinth. For then St. Paul had Jews opposing him; and St. Paul departed from the dwelling in which he was staying with Prisca and Aquila; and perhaps some case not otherwise written occurred then, in which these spouses exposed themselves to the danger of death for the life of St. Paul.

¶ “To whom not only I give thanks”—that is, not I alone—but also all the Churches of the gentiles.” From this it is clear that the life of St. Paul was then in great peril. Therefore all the Churches of the gentiles, for whom the life of St. Paul was so useful afterward, ought to give thanks to Prisca and Aquila.

¶ “And greet the Church in their house,” namely, of Prisca and Aquila; and this is referred to “greet.”

¶ “Greet Epaphroditus, my beloved, who is the firstfruits of Achaia in Christ Jesus.” By the error of copyists, the name of Achaia seems to have been changed into Asia. For Epaphroditus is called the firstfruits of Achaia because he was the first fruit of Achaia.

¶ “Greet Mary, who labored much for us,” that is, for us. This Mary is praised because she labored much toward St. Paul and his companions. But where or in what kind of labor this was, is not written.

¶ “Greet Andronicus and Junia,” that is, Junias. It is a proper name of a Jewish man.

¶ “My kinsmen.” Understand here and below that the name of kinship is taken from the people, as above he said all Jews were his kinsmen because of unity of stock, as though one said “my compatriots.”

¶ “And my fellow captives.” Where and when this captivity was, is not written. “Who are notable among the Apostles, who also were in Christ before me.” Andronicus and Junias, Jews by stock, seem to have been disciples of Christ while He was still living in mortal life, from the fact that St. Paul says they were notable among the Apostles of Christ without doubt. Hence it is also held that they, disciples of Christ, perhaps even before St. Peter, taught the faith of Christ at Rome.

¶ “Greet Amplias, my most beloved in the Lord.” That is, “greet Amplias, my beloved, in the Lord.”

TO THE ROMANS

¶ “Greet Urbanus, our helper”—that is, our co-worker—“in Christ, and Stachys, my beloved.”

¶ “Greet Apelles, approved in Christ.”

¶ “Greet those who are of Aristobulus.” “House” is superfluous. And the article placed before the word Aristobulus suggests that the pronoun “those” is to be understood with it. Thus the sense is: those who are from among those of Aristobulus. Understand similarly when it is added, “those of Narcissus,” for “house” is superfluous, and there is a similar article.

¶ “Greet Herodion, my kinsman.”

¶ “Greet those of Narcissus, who are in the Lord.”

¶ “Greet Tryphaena and Tryphosa, who labor in the Lord.”

¶ “Greet Persis the most dear,” that is, the beloved, “who labored much in the Lord.”

¶ “Greet Rufus, chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine.”

¶ “Greet Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, and the brothers who are with them.”

¶ “Greet Philologus and Julia, Nereus and his sister, and Olympias,” that is, Olympa, “and all the saints who are with them.”

¶ “Greet one another with a holy kiss. All the Churches of Christ greet you.” “All” is superfluous.

¶ “But I beseech you, brothers, that you observe those who cause dissensions and offenses contrary to the doctrine that you have learned, and turn away from them.” St. Paul knew Jews who, under the appearance of good, sowed the legal observances of the law of Moses, and thus carried dissensions and scandals among Christians.

¶ “For such do not serve Christ our Lord, but their own belly; and by sweet words and blessings”—that is, by flattering speech and praise—“they seduce the hearts of the innocent.”

¶ “For your obedience has been made known in every place,” that is, it has reached all, without doubt by name and report. “I therefore rejoice concerning you; but I want you to be wise in good”—that is, unto

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

good—"and simple in evil," that is, sincere toward evil, not corrupted, not contaminated with evil. And the discourse is of moral evil.

¶ "But may the God of peace crush"—that is, will crush—"Satan under your feet swiftly." He asserts and pronounces that divine help will be present to crush quickly Satan, that is, the devil, the enemy of Christians. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you."

¶ "Timothy greets you." This is that Timothy who was St. Paul's disciple. "My helper," that is, my co-worker, for it signifies a companion and fellow in the work. "And Lucius and Jason and Sosipater, my kinsmen."

¶ "I Tertius, who wrote this Epistle, greet you." In some places it is read "I Terentius," but it seems it should be read "Tertius." And it is the proper name of the scribe who wrote this Epistle as St. Paul dictated. For he, having received leave from St. Paul, inserted this greeting of his own. "In the Lord." This can be referred to "I wrote," to exclude any price; and it can be referred to "I greet you."

¶ "Gaius, my host, and of the whole Church, greets you," that is, of the whole Church. It is read that St. Paul lodged in diverse houses at Corinth at diverse times, as is clear in Acts of the Apostles chapter 18. And this Gaius is the one whom St. Paul says he baptized in First Epistle to the Corinthians chapter 1. He was a host not only to St. Paul but also to all Christians passing through. Hence it is clear that St. Paul wrote this Epistle at Corinth, still lodging with Gaius.

¶ "Erastus, the treasurer of the city, greets you." Those who dislike the name "treasurer" signify this office as either quaestor of the treasury or procurator. For he had the care of the city's goods at Corinth, like a steward or manager, as the Greek text sounds.

¶ "And Quartus, the brother." The proper name is Quartus. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen."

¶ "But to Him who is able to confirm you." Note, prudent reader, that this whole clause up to the end does not have a clear construction because of the relative pronoun added at the end without a verb. Therefore it would not be unfitting if this clause were continued with the

TO THE ROMANS

preceding, so that it would be said: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen. But to Him who is able to confirm you," that is: let the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ indeed be with you, but let it be to the glory of Him who is able to confirm you. So that, just as above he said, "Whether we live or die, we live for the Lord and die for the Lord," so now he may say concerning the being of grace in them that it is for the Lord who is able to confirm them. Note, however, that in very many Greek codices this clause is not found at all; but in very many it is found here, and in some it is found at the end of chapter 14.

¶ "According to my Gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ." The confirmation of Christians is described from the power of God, both as evangelized by St. Paul himself and as preached by Jesus Christ, so that the Romans may understand on every side that the firmness of Christians will not fail.

¶ "According to the revelation of the mystery." Whether by the name of "mystery" in this place is meant the mystery of the Incarnate Word, or the mystery of the firmness of Christians, is not easy to distinguish. Yet according to the letter it seems the mystery of the Incarnate Word is to be understood, not only in itself but also in its fruit. And thus each is included, for the firmness of Christians is according to the revelation of the mystery of the Incarnate Word.

¶ "Kept silent in eternal times." That is, hidden through all past times from eternity. Not that there were eternal times in reality before, but imaginary ones, for eternity surpasses eternal times, whether real (if they had existed) or imaginary (which we understand when we say "before, before").

¶ "But now made manifest." That is, "but now made manifest through the prophetic Scriptures." The mystery of the Incarnate Word was kept silent in eternal times, existing with God alone; but it was made manifest now, in the coming of the Messiah, through the prophetic Scriptures. He designates two times. One is the time of the prophets, who foretold this mystery, yet then it was not made manifest, because it was written by the prophets under a veil. The other is the time of the

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

Apostles, beginning from Christ. And this is shown when he says “now made manifest,” with the testimony also of the prophetic Scriptures.

¶ “According to the command of the eternal God.” He adds a third condition of so great a mystery. For after he said that it was kept silent in eternal times and that it is now made manifest through the prophetic Scriptures, he adds that it is made known among all gentiles not rashly or by chance, but according to the command of the eternal God—and not without fruit, but “unto the obedience of faith,” that is, so that all gentiles may obey faith. “Unto obedience of faith among all gentiles,” that is, unto all gentiles, made known.

¶ “To the only wise God.” This dative is joined to that dative at the beginning of this clause, namely, “to Him.” And if the word “only” is referred to “God” (“to the only wise God”), it does not need a gloss. But if it is joined to “wise,” then “only” is wise as “only” is good: that is, He alone from His own nature is good and wise.

¶ “Through Jesus Christ, to whom be honor and glory.” “Honor and” is superfluous, and likewise “of ages.” It should read: “Through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory forever. Amen.” And the plain order of the text is: to God, through Jesus Christ, be glory forever. Amen. The verb “is” or “may it be” is understood. And thus the text of the Epistle to the Romans ends.

¶ Among the Greeks, however, these words are found added: “To the Romans: it was written from Corinth through Phoebe, minister of the Church of Cenchreae.” From this writing it is clear in what place this Epistle was written, consonant with what was said above; and that it was sent through that woman named Phoebe, who was a minister of the Church of Cenchreae. Nor was it unfitting for St. Paul to use the offered convenience of an honorable woman, well established and of mature character, who was going to Rome not without her own business. For the safest and most certain bearer of the Epistle was chosen: both because of the reverence customarily shown to such matrons, and because of the certainty that she would not wander or turn aside elsewhere, as could have happened with men. Amen.

Commentary on Romans

Across sixteen tightly wrought chapters, Cardinal Tommaso de Vio, O.P. (Cajetan) leads the reader line by line through St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans from the Greek text, pressing the Apostle's argument with the precision of a schoolman and the attentiveness of a philologist. He fixes the sense by punctuation and syntax; marks lexical ambiguities in the Greek; distinguishes what belongs to the letter, what follows by implication, and what is held only "generally" rather than in every case; and repeatedly orders moral and doctrinal conclusions by careful principles—e.g., why sins may never be chosen as means to a good end, even when divine justice and mercy take occasion from them. In doing so he supplies a distinctive early-modern scholastic commentary: compact, argumentative, and relentlessly clarificatory, aiming less at ornament than at the disciplined disclosure of Paul's meaning and its theological entailments.

Contained in this Volume:

Ad Lectorem • Commentary on Chapters 1–16

Sonnet 4.5 / Gpt 5.2

Machine Translation